This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

ANNEX

THE

CHRISTIAN MAGAZINE,

CONDUCTED

BY MEMBERS OF MENDON ASSOCIATION.

FOR THE YEAR 1827.

VOLUME IV.

Boston:
T. R. MARVIN, PRINTER, 32, CONGRESS STREET.
1827.

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
382814
ASTOR LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS.
R 1907

INDEX.

Afflictions 310
Anecdote of Hume 241
——— of Cecil 160
Arminians, meeting of 159
Aphorisms 94, 121, 181, 242, 311, 379
Atheist, heroism of 240
Ardent Spirits, traffick in 372
Balfour's opinion of the Devil—carried out 236, 270, 360
"Bible There" 94
Busy Bodies 275
Charity to the sick 345
Christianity, uncompromising character of 263
Conference, familiar 326
Controversy, Religious 176
Correspondents, answers to 32, 64, 192, 288, 320
Courage, true 93
——— of Deist 309
Dancing, on 310
Dangerous Consequences of over statements 47
——— remarks on 139
Death, eternal 75
Dialogue, imaginary between St. Paul and St. Luke 119
Deist, courage of 309
Evils in the journey of life 346
Exegesis of Math. xxiv. 29—31 40
Exposition II Peter iii. 14—16 161
——— of Math. xxii. 41—45 342
——— of I Cor. xi. 10 5
——— of Math. iii. 8 48
——— of Philip. iii. 8—11 357
Family Prayer 308
Forbearance of God towards the wicked 97
God, wrong views of the glory of 131
— how ought to be worshipped 170
Gospel, young men in peculiar danger of disregarding the 114
Godly Sorrow, and the Sorrow of the World 377
Hale, Sir M. on the sanctification of the sabbath 307
Heart, opposed to truth 346
Heroism of the Atheist 240
Haman, remarks on the history of 353
Human Life, the fleeting tenure of 378
Indiscretion in the pulpit 45
——— Remarks on 139
Judge and Universalist 59
Lavater, resolutions of 179
Lotteries, effects of 29, 93
Means, essential to the perseverance and salvation of the saints 21, 50
Meeting great, of Arminians at Constantinople 159
——— Eighteenth annual of the American Board 350
——— Interesting 351
Minors in the Church 9
Missionary establishments 60
——— Intelligence 189
Money, lover of 240
Name above every name 309
Obituary Notices,
Mrs. Judson 192
Mrs. Temple 192
George Tamoree 192
Rev. H. H. F. Sweet 223
Mrs. L. Wright 127
Ordinations and Installations 32, 64, 96 128, 160, 224, 288, 320, 379
Paradox, Christian 329
Party Spirit 241
Penitentiary System 85
Pilgrim's Progress in the nineteenth century 16, 77, 107, 163, 207, 296. 335 364
Pamphlet, notice of a late 375
Poetry 380
Regeneration, colloquy on the means of 231
Remarks on Indiscretion in the pulpit and over statements 139
Religious Intelligence 30, 60, 95, 125
Reasons, seven why we should not attend plays, balls, &c. 28
Religion, state of 126
Retrospect of the year 61

Review of Assistant to Family Religion 252
——— of Prof. Fitch's Discourse 121
——— of Am. Unitarian Tracts 147
181, 212, 242, 277
——— of Rev. Mr. Pierpont's Sermon 347
Rhetoric, sacred 1
Revivals 60
Salvation, how to obtain a good hope of 86
Scoffer confounded 94
Sects, religious 340
Sermon, Thanksgiving 33
Sermons 65, 225, 257
Slander 275
Society, Prot. Evan. Missionary, France 125
——— British and For. Bible 310
Straight Road 274
Submission, inquiries respecting 25
——— answers to inquiries respecting 54
Self-examination 371
Theology, utility of historical 7
Theatre, do people go from, to heaven 24
Trumpeting and puffing 14
Truth, the heart opposed to 346
Twins 177
Unitarianism, a hard religion 11
Universal Salvation, doctrine of 26
Universalist, argument of 301, 321

THE

CHRISTIAN MAGAZINE.

VOL. IV. JANUARY, 1827. No. 1.

SACRED RHETORIC.

To the Editors of the Christian Magazine,

GENTLEMEN,

IT is a subject of much satisfaction to the enlightened friends of Christianity, that there is manifest, among the American Churches, an increased and increasing attention to Sacred Rhetoric. The gospel does not acknowledge itself *dependent* on this, or any other art or science, for its success. But still it does not disdain any voluntary and free-will offering from any branch of learning. There is a clear distinction between meretricious ornament, and sophistry; the arts of a spurious popularity, and the sober, substantial aids of well defined principles of knowledge. While St. Paul utterly rejected the unnatural collocation of words, and foolish gesticulations and tones,—"the wisdom of words,"—adopted by the Greeks to give their proud and empty philosophy, a venerated character in the eyes of the multitude, he never refused to avail himself of the knowledge of nature and of facts, in his preaching and defence of the gospel. To this purpose he availed himself, doubtless by inspiration, of what he knew of the characters and crimes of men; he brought to his aid the knowledge of history, of natural philosophy, of mythology, and even of poetry and commerce. These facts might be confirmed by quotations from his Epistles. But this is unnecessary. They are more than sufficient to overthrow all objections against the employment of Rhetoric in defence of the christian cause. For what is Rhetoric but the application of the knowledge of nature on a particular subject, to the promotion of the best interests of man? What is a good writer, but he who presents truth in such a way as an uninstructed child would present a truth of the same nature, which he perfectly comprehended? What is a good speaker, but one who utters every kind of truth in the same manner, as to tones, looks and gestures, in which a statement of the same kind is made by a man wholly in earnest and unembarrassed? But I fear that I have detained you too long on a mere exordium. What I propose is to offer some thoughts on

PREACHING TERROR.

The certainty, and duration, and dreadfulness, of future punishment, belong appropriately to the department of the theologian. For myself, I have no doubt of

the certainty and eternity of future punishment. The frequency of preaching on the subject, and the manner of writing and speaking, belong to the department of sacred rhetoric.

1. The frequency of preaching terror. On this subject it is a good rule not to preach it *always*. One grand principle may be considered as fundamental in the breasts of all conscientious preachers, that terror, and indeed every other part of the gospel, ought to be preached in such a manner, as to produce the best *effect*. And is it not an obvious truth, that *any* subject, perpetually before the mind, or of frequent occurrence, looses thereby a great portion of its influence? The soldier, the sailor, and the surgeon, can each bear testimony, that the frequent occurrence of a dreadful object tends greatly to diminish the force of the impression it is suited to make on the mind, and the feelings. The Bible is not *all* terror. This is a sufficient reason why ministers should not always preach it. Permit me now to inquire, Messrs. Editors, if there are not some preachers, who, in their most commendable zeal to write a good application to their Sermons, seldom fail, even for one Sabbath, or one Sermon, to preach terror? May not a good application be written without this? It ought to be remembered that the last impression on the mind of the hearer thrusts out, in a degree, those which went before it. If then this last impression is perpetually that made by terror, is not the general effect of such a man's ministry much the same as it would be if he preached on no other subject. The wicked hearer, who declares that his minister preaches nothing but hell and damnation, describes precisely the effect which the preaching has produced on his mind; and the temper with which he declares it, shows too plainly that it has done him no good. The application of a sermon may be, and often is, nearly all that is heard or remembered. A student in one of our Colleges was once heard to say, as he was going to the place of public worship, "I hope I shall get to sleep before the anathemas begin to fly." I have selected above the most unexceptionable case of the too frequent preaching of terror. Concerning those, if there be any, who always do this because they have nothing else to preach, or are too indolent to prepare a sermon on a more difficult subject, the course they pursue is sufficiently full of matter of lamentation to be passed over in silence.

But while the minister of Jesus Christ ought to guard against the too frequent exhibition of terror, he ought not on the other hand to be too sparing in the faithful declaration of this part of the gospel. Declarations full of terror are not unfrequent in scripture, neither should they be in sermons. It is impossible to give *precise rules* on the subject. Much room is, and must be, left for the exercise of a sound discretion. And the man, who is unable to exercise this vitally important faculty, in an eminent degree, ought not, in my opinion, to be a preacher.

2. The manner of writing on this subject. Some have advocated the propriety of employing the language of scripture, exclusively, in preaching terror. It may, however, be difficult to assign a reason for this, in the present case, more than in any other. It seems more important to re-

mark that the preacher is not at liberty to transcribe into a sermon all the expressions of scripture, which proclaim terror. All the sentiments of scripture, we have, undoubtedly, a right to employ. But some of the expressions are different in our translation from what they are in the original: And others have a meaning, associated with them in the minds of most hearers, which did not belong to them originally. And besides, preachers, at the present day, ought not to feel themselves on an equality with the inspired penmen, and with Jesus Christ. "Another erroneous principle," said President Edwards, "that some have been at least in danger of, is, that ministers, because they speak as Christ's ambassadors, may assume the same style and speak with the same authority that the Prophets of old did; yea, that Jesus Christ did in the 23d of Matthew. 'Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell!' &c.

"The principle is absurd, because it makes no difference in the degrees and orders of messengers; though God has made a very great difference; for tho' they all come, in some respect, in the name of God, and with something of his authority, yet certainly there is a vast difference in the *degree* of authority with which God has invested them. As there is a great difference in their authority, and as Christ came as God's messenger, in a vastly higher manner, [than an ordinary minister,] so another style became him, vastly more authoritative, than is proper for us worms of the dust; though we are messengers also of an inferior degree. It would be strange if God, when he has made so great a difference in the degree in which he has invested different ministers with his authority, should make no difference as to the *outward appearance and show* of authority."*

If then ministers may not imitate Christ in some of his expressions on this subject, they surely may not go beyond him. They may not rack their invention to find the most dreadful language in which to address their fellow men on the most dreadful subject. Were the preacher's heart *full* of love to his hearers, he would find no temptation to do this. There is reason to think it best to avoid, generally, such language as is expressive of bodily suffering. The immortal author of "The Wealth of Nations," in his "theory of moral sentiments," remarks, "In some of the Greek tragedies, there is an attempt to excite compassion by the representation of bodily pain. Philoetetes cries out and faints, Hyppollitus and Hercules expire. These attempts to excite compassion by the representation of bodily pain, may be regarded as among the greatest breaches of decorum of which the Greek stage has set the example." He asks, with much force, "what kind of tragedy would that be, the subject of which was a violent fit of the colic?" With much greater emphasis, may we not ask, what kind of hell would that be which should consist in a perpetual toothache or colic? Are not all representations of this sort infinitely beneath the subject? Are they suited to affect the heart? But are not all representations of bodily suffering, of every kind, in some degree of the same nature? That there will be bodily suffering in the world of despair, is beyond dispute. But

* See Edwards' Thoughts on the Revival of Religion, part iv. sec. 2.

the scripture represents it as mainly the *effect* of mental agony. Who can read of weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth, without feeling that the source of them is mental anguish? There is reason to think, from a few experiments, that a faithful analysis of the language of scripture would result in the conviction that the principal source of future misery will be mental anguish and despair. Against all representations of bodily suffering, there is this strong objection, founded in the constitution of man—that such is the natural sympathy of the mind with the body, that the former braces itself, involuntarily, to endure what is inflicted on the latter. The grand hope of making sinners feel that they *cannot* "dwell with devouring fire," arises from being able to make them feel that the fortitude of the soul will be destroyed by its own sufferings. Would not this mode of writing serve to guard against another mistake, that of supposing terror to consist in *words* rather than in *thoughts*. There is more real and affecting terror in a sentence like this, "Every one of us shall give account of himself to God," or this, "God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil," when brought down before a congregation, to apply to all the particular parts of human life and conduct, than in all the hard and terrible words ever clustered into the most frightful sounding sermon. Every attentive observer of the effects of preaching, must have seen that a congregation will sit very quietly, and with apparent indifference, to hear the most shocking description of bodily pain, as the future punishment of sin. At this day, we read with astonishment of the effects produced on congregations, 70 years ago, in this land, by the preaching of terror. President Edwards says, he rejoiced to see men so impressed as to be the subjects of very visible bodily affections. Much no doubt of the effects of preaching, in his day, of every kind, was owing to the special operations of the Holy Spirit. But it is very obvious, that nothing will so soon make the body writhe, as a representation of mental agony. May we not suppose it was in this way, that his masterly pen produced, by the blessing of God, such wonderful effects? He certainly was far above all those arts, by which an impassioned declaimer seeks to throw his hearers into a flood of tears. And yet his congregation often wept and cried out aloud.

The manner of speaking is, perhaps, not less important, than the manner of writing, on this subject. Nothing can be more unnatural than a cold, unfeeling, *hard* manner of proclaiming the terrors of the Lord. Who can believe that the preacher is in earnest, unless he appears to *feel* what he says? Let two things combine to impress the preacher's mind, and he can scarcely fail to speak well on this subject—a deep sense of the certainty and awfulness of the truths he declares—and an ardent love for souls. Those who have heard a preacher in the time of a revival of religion, when his own faith in invisible things was so strengthened and quickened as to give him a lively view of future misery; and when his heart was melted with love to his hearers; must have observed that his whole frame seemed to tremble under an impression of the infinite magnitude and importance of what he

was about to say, when he proclaimed the terrors of the Lord—his affection for his hearers almost interrupted his utterance, and gave a deep-toned mellowness to his voice, which, united with his pale countenance, and the starting tear, gave a solemnity and certainty to his message not easily resisted. R. N. M.

For the Christian Magazine.

Messrs. Editors,

I HAVE thought that a brief exposition of some difficult passage of Scripture, inserted in each number of your valuable Magazine, would be acceptable to many of its readers. I submit to you the following: and, if this meets your approbation, I will endeavor to furnish you, occasionally, with a piece of this description.

—

EXPOSITION OF 1 CORINTHIANS, xi. 10.

For this cause ought the woman to have power on her head, because of the angels.— *Διὰ τουτο ὀφείλει η γυνὴ ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς, διὰ τους αγγελους.*

"Mr. Locke," says Dr. Doddridge, "acknowledges with a modesty which does him much honor, that he did not understand this text." Many other commentators have evidently been in the same perplexity respecting it with Mr. Locke. Rosenmüller calls it, "locus vexatus:"—*a perplexing passage.* And it is apprehended that generally, by common readers, its true meaning is not obtained. When it is said that "the woman ought to have power on her head," the import is not clear. The original word, (ἐξουσίαν,) rendered "power," among its more prominent significations, denotes *authority.* In a secondary sense, it signifies the *emblem* or *badge* of authority. It is then used in a still greater latitude, to represent any mark of distinction: and seems here to be employed by the Apostle, passively, to denote the emblem or badge of being subject to authority.* The same thing is evidently intended by it, which is referred to in several other places in this chapter, as a covering for the head.† This covering, worn by the woman, was considered as an expression of her subjection to the man. "A man indeed ought not to cover his head, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God:" he stands at the head of this lower world. "But the woman is the glory of the man." "The woman was made for the man."‡ In a certain sense, she holds a secondary rank. It was proper, therefore, that she should have a regard to this fact: that her demeanour should correspond with the station in which an all-wise Providence had placed her. She ought to wear a covering on her head, in their religious assemblies, and in all public places, inasmuch as the contrary proceeding would manifest a want of modesty—would show a masculine boldness, altogether unbecoming the female character.

This, says the Apostle, ought to be done, "because of the angels." Whom are we to understand by these angels? Beza thinks, The prophets, or teachers, who were present, speaking and officiating as messengers from God. Ministers are often called, "messengers," or "angels."§ Calvin says, "Celestial spirits, present in the assembly." Pareus says the same. According to him, "The Apostle admonished that women ought to take heed not to offend by any impropriety

* So Glassi Phil. Sac.
† Verses 4, 5, 6, 7, 13. ‡ Verses 7, 9.
§ Mal. ii. 7. Rev. chap 2 and 3.

these pure and holy spirits, the guardians of the church, and the inspectors of its worship."* Doddridge interprets the passage in the same manner.—"Because of the angels, who are especially present there, [in worshipping assemblies] and before whom we ought to be exceedingly careful that nothing pass which may be indecent and irregular, and unlike that perfect order and profound humility with which they worship in the Divine presence."† Scott says, "Probably the Apostle referred to the presence of holy angels—as spectators, or even in some respects as joint worshippers with believers in their public assemblies; which therefore ought to be regulated with the most exact propriety, that these heavenly worshippers might not witness any thing unbecoming so holy an occasion."‡ Dr. Whitby understands by "the angels," *evil spirits* present for the purposes of mischief."§

All these interpretations are evidently strained; and seem resorted to, not because the writers were satisfied with them, but because a better did not in their judgment occur. There is an interpretation suggested by Dr. Doddridge in a note, as from Mr. Gough's Dissertation on the passage, which, it appears to me, is the true one. By the angels here mentioned, Mr. G. "understands *spies;* who he supposes came into christian assemblies to make ill-natured remarks, and so would be glad to blaze abroad any indecencies they might observe there." It is certainly very natural to suppose that some persons would resort to the worshipping assemblies of this new religion, to see what they could discover, and to carry away reports of what they had witnessed. And the original word, (αγγελους) rendered *angels*, may, without any violation, be understood as denoting these persons. Indeed it is the same word which the Apostle James uses, to designate the messengers whom Joshua sent as spies to Jericho. Rahab, he says, "received the messengers, (τους αγγελους, *the spies*,) and sent them out another way."* And some of the best critics in the language of the New Testament, actually give the word this meaning in the passage now before us: "*spies*, who, from among the heathen, are present in your sacred assemblies, for the purpose of making their observations."†

Here, then, it appears to me that we find an interpretation of the passage, natural, easy, and free from the difficulties and objections which attend the others. The Apostle enjoined it on females, in their christian assemblies, to appear with a due regard to modesty and propriety; to avoid every thing which would look like forwardness, or like usurping an authority which did not belong to them; so that the enemies of christianity, who were watching for occasion, might have no evil thing to say against it. Probably some evils of the kind referred to, had existed. The Apostle directed his remarks to correct them.—The passage recognizes that general dictate of common sense, that men and women are appointed to move in different spheres, and appear best when they act each in their appropriate character. "An *effeminate* man, and a *masculine* woman, will always be disgusting and shameful."—The passage shows likewise that christians are not released from the rules of common

* Vid. Pareus in loc. † Dod. in loc.
‡ Scott in loc. § As quoted by Dod.

* James, ii. 25. † Schleusner.

propriety. The things which nature itself teaches them, and the things established by custom, when there is no evil in them, are to be duly regarded. L.

For the Christian Magazine.

UTILITY OF HISTORICAL THEOLOGY.

Numerous and convincing facts evince the rapid growth of science in our country. In such a state of society, it is but natural to conclude, that every branch of knowledge will be advancing. Were this not the case, like a human body that loses its proportion, the mind would become deformed. Aversion to this deformity has led the wise in every age, as far as possible, to cultivate a steady and equal increase of the various branches of science.

Among the studies peculiar to a christian minister, that which seems hitherto, in a measure, to have been neglected, is Historical Theology. By this is comprehended all the dealings of God towards men, as recorded on the pages of sacred and ecclesiastical history. In his word God has taught us what to believe, and what to do. This is theology in theory. In his providence we see his hand moving and directing the wheels of nature. This is theology in practice.

We learn much from the painter when we hear him unfold his plan, describe the process, and tell the result. But all this falls far below the lively view which we obtain when the picture is placed before our eyes. So in reading the book of revelation, we learn much of the character and will of God. But this does not exhibit him as present to the sight, and operating amongst us, as we see him in his providence, and as he appears on the faithful page of history.

Were we to regard this study merely as a pleasing one, it would bear a comparison with any other. As mere history, it exhibits a greater hero, a deeper plot, and incidents more various and interesting than any other, real or fictitious. Nor is this all. In other history the character of man is presented in its dark deformity. Here we see it as it begins to be gilded by the beams of the sun of righteousness. We faintly trace some lines of beauty. And these lines derive a tenfold lustre from the surrounding darkness.

But, from historical theology we derive solid advantages.

The knowledge which it reveals is true philosophy. It exhibits man as he is. The history of the church is a history of facts. Like other authentic records it is equally entitled to our attention and credit. By studying this, the preacher becomes acquainted with human nature. He learns its operation while wholly under the influence of depravity, and also as it is affected by religious cultivation. He sees what motives will have influence upon man, and how the truth may be directed, so that, like the arrow, it should pierce the heart.

Historical Theology, is a history of divine providence. The exhibitions of God in his providence, dissipate the clouds which are round about him, and bring to light many of his mysterious designs. Here we see how he controls all human events—brings good out of evil—and accomplishes the purposes of his benevolence respecting his children.

The history of the church of God is a commentary upon his word. It explains and confirms,

but never contradicts the scriptures. Does the bible say that man is sinful and proud? The religious history of the world confirms it. Does the bible contain a peculiar set of principles and rules for human conduct? Religious history shows their tendency and effects, both when fully embraced and followed; and also when but imperfectly understood. And it shows in contrast, the influence of other systems, which the ingenuity or fanaticism of man has devised.

The bible is an ancient book, adapted to customs and opinions long since passed away. A knowledge of these opinions and customs is necessary in order to understand many parts of scripture: yet these can only be known by a familiar acquaintance with history. And this study is becoming increasingly necessary as our manners differ more widely from the ancients, and we recede from the ages in which the scriptures were written.

The bible contains many positive institutions. These have been the subject of continued controversy. A record of the opinions and practice of the church respecting this controversy, cannot fail to be important. By this record too we learn what have been the speculations of men—when these speculations have succeeded, and when they have failed. Thus we treasure up the wisdom of ages, for our benefit in time of need. And when pressed with questions of doubt and difficulty, who would not gladly resort for aid to such a source?

Like the chart to the mariner, this is a guide to our devious course. It shows us the shoals and quicksands where others have been lost; and warns us to avoid the dangers of the way.

From this we refute the objections of the infidel. How will you convince an unbeliever that the bible is the book of God, so well as by appealing to that very evidence by which he thinks to prove it false? He objects to its authenticity—to its inspiration—to the spirit of prophecy which its writers possessed, and to the miracles which they wrought. And to history the appeal must be made. To this he himself resorts. This is his chief weapon of defence. If you can wrest this weapon from his grasp, and make it recoil upon himself, he can no longer withstand. You have given him the fatal thurst.

And to show the infinite superiority of the christian religion—to every other, we need only resort to facts, as they lie in the pages of universal history. Compare the writings of the Apostles with every other production of that age. Mark the regular advance or decline of prosperity and refinement with that of religious knowledge. View the present condition of the world.—Why are the present inhabitants of our country more refined and happy than its former possessors? Because they are governed, in some degree, by the spirit of this religion. And why, in every part of the world, do nations prosper, in proportion as they embrace christianity, while no other religion under heaven affords this prosperity? Manifestly, because the christian religion alone is fitted to produce such effects. In this view, the testimony of history in favor of the religion of the bible, is overwhelming. No nation has ever continued degraded while they cherished and cultivated the spirit of christianity. And no nation however prosperous has continued to flourish, while they have

abandoned the christian religion and made shipwreck of their faith. But arguments such as these can neither be used nor estimated, except by him who is familiar with history.

This knowledge will enable the preacher to give richness and variety to all his instructions. While christianity retains its peculiar features, it cannot be exhibited with too much loveliness and beauty. The charge of austerity has been preferred against it; and not in every instance without foundation. There is, indeed, a complying spirit, which, in the view of many, is the boast and glory of our age. But truth remains unchanged. And the aid of history, in this connexion, is not to change that which is immutable, but to give richness and variety to that which is abiding. The objection is to be refuted, not by abandoning the truth of God, and substituting a system to please men. But while the truth is retained in all its length and breadth, by exhibiting it with such a variety of illustration, with such a richness of thought, and with a taste so refined and delicate, that even those who hate it shall be compelled to say that they would rather listen to the truth thus adorned, with the consciousness that all her ornaments are her own, than to attend to the most splendid exhibitions of genius, under the conviction that it is nothing but the production of a luxurient imagination, and playful fancy. There is nothing criminal—nay, it is a duty, innocently to exercise such craftiness, and catch men with guile. And by taking his examples from history, the preacher avoids that cold speculation which freezes the heart. He draws his illustration from the life, and thus renders his instructions highly practical.

The day has come when he who pursues the old scholastic method of teaching, destroys his usefulness. To avoid this beaten track he must give variety to his reading. And here also he will find that the aid of history is great.

By ecclesiastical history we extend our christian acquaintance. To cultivate a knowledge of this, is to become acquainted with the saints of every age. As we peruse their lives, our sympathies are enkindled, we learn to emulate their zeal. And while we read of their temptations and supports, their conflicts and victories, we catch their heaven born spirit, and press onward with redoubled zeal against every opposing foe. Before we reach our final rest we become acquainted with the inhabitants of that happy world—with Abraham, and David, and Paul, and Luther, and Whitfield, and Edwards, and the great company of the redeemed. So that when we arrive there, we shall not meet them as strangers, but shall be welcomed as friends and brethren. S. S.

For the Christian Magazine.

MINORS IN A CHURCH.

Messrs. Editors,

It is said by some, that minors, or those under age, in a church, have a right to vote in all its affairs. This is said, as I must presume, upon the ground that they are members, and entitled to all its privileges, of which voting is one. I can think of no other argument which can be offered to show that they have a right to vote in the church to which they belong. It appears to me that

the fate of this argument must decide the fate of all others which relate to the subject. If the ground stated be not tenable, I think that no other can be. Now I would say, and expect to show, that merely their being members of the church, does not give minors the right for which some contend. If it does, then all female members have a right to vote. Why, then, have they so generally and so long been deprived of the exercise of this right? They ought to assert it, and it ought to be allowed them. Surely, they are not denied this right on account of mental incapacity. Many of them are as capable of judging and of acting in regard to the interests and measures of the church, as are the males who are under age, and some of them much more capable than many of the young men who belong to our churches. Has Christ excluded females from the right which it is so strenuously urged belongs to minors? Have his Apostles? Let those who can, make it appear. It may, with some plausibility, be shown, that women are not to speak in a church; but is there any thing in the Bible to show, that they may not vote when others have spoken? Not a syllable. Voting, and speaking, are different things; and there may be good reasons why females should not speak in the church, and still it may be proper for them to give a silent vote. Is it said, that voting would be usurping authority over the men, it is, therefore, forbidden in the general prohibition? It is in point to reply, that minors are to be in subjection to their parents and masters, and not to usurp authority over them. In many, if not in most of our churches, there is a majority of females. They might carry the vote in all the proceedings of the churches to which they belong, and in all ecclesiastical affairs. They might settle, or dismiss a minister; admit, or excommunicate members. I do not say, but it might be best that they should have the ascendancy; but I *do* say, let theory and conduct be consistent. If any will contend that minors have a right to vote, on the ground of their being members, let them contend too, that females have the same right and upon the same ground. They will then appear to be consistent, and to contend for principle, and not to serve a purpose.

It should not be forgotten, that in many churches there is a large proportion of young females; these, together with minors among the males, if allowed to vote, may conduct the whole affairs and interests of the churches to which they belong. The observation, experience and discretion of older members, may be of little effect. Though females, it may be said, do not vote, yet they may exert an influence over the males, and in this way have a voice in the church. So may minors. They may express their views and feelings in private, to the acting members, concerning a minister, and the admission and discipline of members, and concerning any other subject of importance. Their opinion and influence will, generally, have weight in the decisions of the church. It is very little to the purpose to urge that *some* under age in the church, are better able to judge respecting those things which come before the church, than those who are older, and therefore they ought to be allowed the privilege of voting. The difficulty is in making the dis-

crimination. All minors must be allowed to vote, or none. One has as much a right as another, on the ground of membership. Minors are under the control and influence of parents or guardians, and are more, dependent than those who are of age. Through them, if allowed to vote, unprincipled parents and guardians, may have a great control over the affairs of the church.

For the information of any who wish to know, concerning the fact, I would state, that minors do not vote in some of the churches among us. In ordinary cases there may be no harm in their voting, provided it be understood that it is a privilege granted to them, and not a right which they may claim. Should occasion require, you may hear again from

TIMOTHY.

For the Christian Magazine.

UNITARIANISM A HARD RELIGION.

A DISTINGUISHED Unitarian has recently said and published, that "*Unitarianism is the hardest religion in the world.*"* The words struck me, on reading them, as peculiarly forcible, and as expressing very nearly my own sentiments—applying them, of course, in a sense somewhat different from that of the writer.—In the remarks which follow, I shall assign *several reasons*, why Unitarianism would be to me, even could I be induced to embrace it, a *hard* or uncomfortable scheme of religion. And,

1. In regard to a number of very important particulars, I should not be able to determine *what it was*. As Unitarianism has been described, by some of its abettors, to consist chiefly in "*not believing*," I might indeed satisfy myself what it *was not*. I might readily see that it was sufficiently far removed from the Evangelical system of my pilgrim ancestors. But to determine *what it was*, or what it required me to believe, on several points of high importance, would not be so easy. I should not know, for instance, how much of the *Bible* I was to receive as the *word of God*. This sacred volume would itself teach me, that "*all* scripture is given by the inspiration of God;" and that the holy men, through whom we have received it, spake, "not in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the *Holy Ghost teacheth*"—they "spake as they were *moved by the Holy Ghost*;" but the doctrine of the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures, my new brethren would reject with scorn.† They would tell me that I must exercise my own *judgment* respecting what parts of the Bible to receive, as the word of God; and respecting what ought to be the meaning of those parts which I did receive. And with nothing but my own feeble and fallible judgment for an ultimate guide in this important concern, I should feel that I was constantly and fearfully liable to wander from the truth. —On Unitarian principles, I should hardly know what to think of *Christ*. Whether to regard him as a man, or an angel, or a super-angelic being, or a derived and dependent Deity, I could not well determine, and none of my brethren could certainly tell me. They might tell me, indeed, that as the character in which I was required to receive him was altogether an *official* one, the question concerning his person was of no importance; but this would be

* See Christian Register for Dec. 9, 1826.

† See a communication in the Ch. Reg for Nov. 4, 1826, in which the plenary inspiration of the scriptures is opposed, not to say ridiculed.

a difficult lesson for me to learn. —I should be in doubt also, on Unitarian principles, respecting the doctrine of *future retribution*. Whether all are received to heaven at death; or whether a part are annihilated, or punished—and if any are punished, on what grounds, or in what degree, or to what extent, they will be punished;—these certainly are questions of great interest and importance; but questions on which I should receive little light or satisfaction from my new interpreters of the sacred oracles. To live thus in doubt and suspense, respecting articles of the greatest importance in the christian system, would, to me, be painful in the extreme.

2. Unitarianism would be to me a hard religion, because I should find a constant difficulty in reconciling many parts of it with the *plain declarations of Scripture*. I could never avoid seeing, when I looked into my Bible, that there were numerous passages which seemed plainly to teach the Divinity of Christ—the personality and Divinity of the Holy Spirit—the total sinfulness of the natural heart—the necessity of regeneration—the doctrine of justification by faith in the atoning blood of Jesus—the perseverance of saints—and the eternity of future punishments. I might indeed render myself familiar with all the glosses and forced constructions which have been put upon these several passages—I might become as expert as any of my associates in explaining and frittering them away; but when all was said and done, they would remain—they would remain just as they were before—and every time I looked into my Bible, they would stare me in the face. And with all the effrontery I should be able to assume, I suspect they would often look me out of countenance. They would cast "fearful omen" over the whole subject, and bring a cloud upon my heart which nothing would be able to remove.

3. I should often feel unpleasantly, in the reception of Unitarian sentiments, from the fear that they would have an unfavorable influence upon my *religious character*. The writer of the sentence which gave rise to these remarks, admits that his Unitarian brethren *have* such fears "They seem," says he, "to entertain a suspicion, that" their religion "is *not so spiritual*, or *strict in its demands*," as "the popular theology."* I wonder not at all that they have such suspicions, I should be troubled with them myself, were I in their sentiments. For I should know, that some of the principal *motives*, which I now have, for penitence, watchfulness, and diligence in duty, would be materially weakened, if not destroyed. Discarding my present views of the great evil of sin, and of my own depravity and sinfulness; how could I be deeply *penitent?* Closing my eyes upon my spiritual dangers, arising from the deceitfulness of my heart, from its strong natural propensity to evil, and from the presence and power of invisible enemies who are ever seeking my destruction; what motives should I have for close and continual *watchfulness?* And being no longer under the constraining influence of the love of God, in making his son a sacrifice for sinners; and of the love of Christ in consenting to expiate our sins on the cross; and no longer deterred from sin, by the fear of that eternal punishment which God has denounced against it in his word; the motives which now influence me to resist temptation,

* See Christian Register for Dec. 9, 1826.

to overcome the world, and to be diligent and faithful in the performance of duty, must, I am sure, be materially weakened. My fears on this subject would be increased, by the obvious effect of Unitarian principles on the characters of others. Looking around upon my new associates, I should find them, in the general, more conformed to the world, more in love with its vain amusements and pleasures, and, on the whole, less serious, strict, and watchful christians, than those whom I had left behind. The influence of their society and example, I should fear would be unfavorable to my spiritual interests; and the principles which had contributed to form their characters, I should expect would have a similar effect on my own.

4. Unitarianism would be to me an uncomfortable religion, because it provides *no adequate foundation of hope.* An Apostle hath said, "other foundation can no man lay, than that is laid, which is *Jesus Christ.*" But from the merits and atonement of Christ, as a foundation of hope, the Unitarian system would wholly remove me. The supporters of this system have lately published, that "those persons deceive themselves, who, in the apprehension of death, lay hold on the *merits of Christ*, and expect to enter heaven in consequence."* Cut off, in this manner, from relying on the merits of Christ, I should be thrown entirely on *my own* merits; and I could never satisfy myself that these were sufficient. I might close my eyes, so far as possible, to the strictness of the divine law, and the greatness of my own deficiences. I might flatter myself, ever so much, as to the number and value of my supposed virtues; still, I should have painful doubts, whether they were sufficient to recommend me to the divine favor and mercy, to procure the pardon of my sins, and the everlasting salvation of my soul. I should have distressing fears, whenever I gave way to serious thought, that they would prove, at the last, no better than sand. But this brings me to observe again,

5. Unitarianism to me would be a hard religion, because, notwithstanding my utmost endeavors to the contrary, I should be obliged to *distrust it.* This, many professed Unitarians have actually done. In the same article with the sentence which gave rise to these remarks, there is the following expression: "We have sometimes thought that we could perceive, in conversation with Unitarians, a *distrust concerning the system which they have embraced.*"* Now it is not to be wondered at, that they do distrust it. I should distrust it, if I were a Unitarian. I should fear it would not support me at the last. I should know that it had failed many in the near prospect of death; and I should fear it would fail me. And I should have still more painful apprehensions, that it would fail to support me *after* death. When probation was ended, and the light of eternity opened upon me, and it was all too late to retrieve my error; I should fear that I might find myself deceived. Such fears I am satisfied I could not repress; and certainly they would be distressing. They would render my religion more a torment to me than a comfort.

For the reasons here given, Unitarianism would be to me a *hard religion*—if not "the *hardest in the world.*" X.

* See Christian Register for Nov. 4, 1826.

* See Christian Register for Dec. 9, 1826.

For the Christian Magazine.

PUFFING AND TRUMPETING.

PUFFING, is exorbitant praise. It differs from flattery, inasmuch as it is applied not only to persons, but things. It usually carries on the face of it, however artfully the trick may be concealed, that the object puffed needs a puffing; or that the praise given is bestowed for other reasons than those of merit.

Trumpeting, though nearly allied to this, is still different. It is the blazing abroad of small matters, as though they were great; and those of a comparatively private nature, as though they were concerns in which the whole community were interested.

I will not stop to inquire, whether the practices here described fall more properly under the head of follies, or of sins. In either case, it is believed they never were more ridiculously prevalent, than they are at the present period.

A— B— is about to publish a little volume—perhaps a reading book, or a Geography, for the use of schools. Whilst the thing is yet in embryo, its probable future parturition, is whispered to a friend, who is engaged to puff and trumpet it, before its birth. When its existence commences, it must first be shown to the particular favorites of its Author, who are quite enraptured with its charming features, and unite in extolling it as deserving the highest praise. With half a dozen reviewers under special engagements to give it a simultaneous puffing, it is at length exposed to the view of the world. And however much it may disappoint public expectation, no one, by this time, dares utter a syllable to its disparagement. Its name is up—its currency is secured—the critics have approved it—and he who disapproves, only proves himself a dunce. So the swoln little creature is blown about for a while—lives its short day—and then quietly dies—and is heard of no more.

Dr. T. is a clergyman, whose surpassing eloquence is every where celebrated. On a set day, he is expected to preach in the city of B——. The sound is no sooner whispered, than it is eagerly caught, and the country is filled with it, for hundreds of miles round. The expected day at length arrives—the place is thronged—and the great Doctor appears. And though he looks, and speaks, and acts, like other men, and is perhaps inferior to many who have preceded him on a like occasion; it is all the same. What he lacks in merit, is easily made up in praise. There are enough who stand ready to set the puff in motion, and little else is to be heard, for a time, but the story of his talents and excellencies.

The business of puffing is of all others most *capricious*, and is usually confined to limits of its own prescribing. Some men can hardly escape it, however indifferent may be their performances; while on others, the puffing gentry will bestow no favor, whatever may be their talents or deserts. I once heard a particular clerical friend, who is in the line of being puffed, deliver a discourse; and it certainly was a poor one—much below his ordinary performances. But before I left my pew, I was accosted by two or three different persons, with "What an excellent discourse! What an excellent discourse!" And before I left the house, I found that this was the general exclamation. Within a

few hours after, I had the good fortune to be in company with the preacher alone; when I alluded to the praise so generally awarded to his performance. He turned to me with a look of disgust, which I shall never forget, and exclaimed, "It is perfectly ridiculous! The discourse is one of the poorest I have ever made; it has no particular merits; and I am astonished that my friends have not sense enough to see it."

Our *Unitarian* neighbors have long been celebrated for their puffing—I mean, their puffing and praising one another. A. puffs B., and B., A.; and the bellows is continually passing round, that each may be sure to receive his share. I doubt whether there is now a decent Clergyman in their ranks, whose fame and excellencies have not been emblazoned before the public, by those of his own denomination. I have often been amused at the pains which are taken, to give eclat to the names of certain individuals in that connexion. "The Rev. Mr. D—, of N. we understand is supplying, for the present, in the first independent church in the city of B."—"The Rev. Mr. W— of B. is expected to preach, for two or three Sabbaths, to the Unitarian church and society in N." —as though it could be of any possible interest to the public at large, to be informed whether these ministers were with their own people, or were pioneering in distant parts of the country! The following instance will be given, not as more strongly illustrative than some others, but as being of recent occurrence. Sometime in August last, a Unitarian Church was dedicated in the city of Boston. The occasion was announced, in the Christian Register for the week next preceding it; and in the paper following, there was a true and modest account of the exercises. But "think's I to myself," the puff has not yet come, and of course the business cannot stop here. Accordingly, in the next paper, it is taken up again, and one whole column (three lines only excepted) is devoted to the subject. And here we are informed all about it. We are told, not only who read the scripture lessons, but that they "were read in an uncommon style of excellence." We are told that "the singing was ably and judiciously performed, by a select and skilful choir." We are told that "the devotional services were animated and solemn, in unison with the touching and interesting occasion." We are told, also, not only who read the hymns, but what hymns were read; and a part of the hymns are even given. The Sermon is puffed much as usual; and neither the house, the society, the candidate, nor indeed any thing connected with the whole concern, is permitted to escape.

I would I could exculpate our *Orthodox* brethren from following hard upon the example which Unitarians have set them, in trumpeting and puffing. But I have seen something like the following farce, acted over and over, before the Orthodox, as well as the Unitarian public, till I am heartily sick of it. "We learn that Mr. A— B—, late from the Theological Seminary at ——, is engaged, for a few Sabbaths, to supply the Church and Society in ——." Before these few Sabbaths are ended, comes the following;— "Mr. A— B—, we are informed, has received a unanimous invitation from the Church and Society in ——, to become their Pastor."

Within the lapse of three or four weeks, the subject comes up again;—"We learn that Mr. A—B—, has accepted the invitation from the Church and Society in ——, to become their Pastor, and that his Ordination is appointed on the —" &c. &c. And lastly, in the order of nature, as well as of time, we have an emblazoned account of the Ordination, in which the reading, the singing, the praying, the preaching, all are set forth, as in a style of excellence surpassing description.—Now *this* is downright puffing and trumpeting. By whomsoever done, it is perfectly ridiculous. I wonder the public are not informed, when some ministers go abroad, and when they stay at home—when they get up, and when they go to bed.

There is another subject which I regret to touch, but which I cannot, in conscience, pass over;—I mean the expression of thanks, by *cards*, in the *public papers*. A worthy clergyman has received, perhaps, twenty dollars from individuals in his parish, to constitute him a life member of the American Tract Society. This is very well indeed; and why cannot this worthy clergyman express his thanks to those individuals, from his desk, or, if he pleases, in some more private way? And why is he obliged, under the color of expressing thanks, to tell the world how charitable his people are—how much they respect and honor him—and how sincerely he loves them, and seeks their good. "When thou doest thine alms, *do not sound a trumpet before thee*, as the hypocrites do, that they may have *glory of men*." W.

From the Utica Christian Repository.

THE PILGRIM'S PROGRESS IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.—BY BUNYANUS.

CHAPTER XIV.

Now I saw in my dream, that by this time the company drew near a house, by the road side, built for the entertainment of pilgrims, and kept by an old pilgrim by the name of Stephanas, one of the descendants of that Stephanas of Achaia, whose household had addicted themselves to the business of ministering to the saints, when St. Paul passed this way. So Thoughtful and Ardent, being desirous of resting a litte, and obtaining some refreshment, proposed to stop. But the rest of the company chose to go on. Then Thoughtful knocked at the door, which was opened by Stephanas himself, who inquired who they were, and what they wanted. So they told him they were pilgrims, going from the city of Destruction to Mount Zion; and being weary in their journey, and having understood that this house was built for the entertainment of pilgrims, they were desirous to stop and rest themselves for a season, and obtain such refreshments as they needed. Then he asked them where they had lodged last, and whether they had brought letters of introduction; for, said he, there are many travellers on this road of late, who endeavor to thrust themselves upon me; but who do not relish the fare which my house affords, and without benefiting themselves destroy the comfort of my family, and of any true pilgrims I may have with me. They have, indeed, put on the pilgrim's dress, and are found in the pilgrim's path; but they have not come in by the door, and their end will be according to their works. So

they told him where they had lodged, and showed them their letters of introduction. Then he said, I know the hand writing. Please to walk in. The good of the house is before you. It is always a pleasure to me, to see the true friends of my Lord, as I hope you are. But who are those men that have just left you? for I saw, through my window, that there were five of you in company.

Th. Their names are Feel-well, Love-self, and No-law. They are from the same place from which we came; but they have not come in company with us all the way. We first saw them come into the way, a little this side of the Interpreter's house, from a by-path, which leads thither, through the village of False-peace.

Stephanas. I can tell something about them then. They are some of Mr. Blind-guide's hearers; they came up the hill of Selfish-sorrow, under the guidance of False-repentance, through the gate of Delusion, into the village of False-peace, by the house of Mr. Self-confidence, through *the way into the way* which leads over the stile of the Hypocrite's Hope. Great numbers come that way of late. I am glad they did not call here. They will find entertainment more to their mind at the house of Mr. *Any-thing*, who lives just between this valley and the next. He always conforms himself to his company in every thing, and professes to agree with every man he meets.

Th. But you are willing to do good unto all men, I trust. Perhaps, if they had called, you might have said something to them to open their eyes; for I fear they are greatly deceived respecting themselves.

Ste. I have had too much acquaintance with such people, to think there is much prospect of undeceiving them. I have seldom known one, who has got into the way by the stile of the Hypocrite's Hope that was ever undeceived. They are usually so wise in their own conceit, that there is more hope of a fool than of them. They are usually ignorant of their own hearts, and ignorant of the King's statute book. And hence it is, that they are wiser in their own eyes, than seven men that can render a reason. Pride and Ignorance are yoke-fellows, and are seldom separated from each other; and when Self-will holds the reins, as he usually does, few can stand before them; for his driving is like the driving of Jehu the son of Nimshi.

Then Stephanas rung a bell, and directed refreshments to be provided for the pilgrims. Meanwhile he continued his discourse with them.

Ste. If you have only come from the house Beautiful to-day, methinks you are late. Has any thing hindered you?

Ard. Yes. We have been led out of the way, and narrowly escaped destruction.

Ste. How did that happen? "Ye did run well; who did hinder you, that ye should not obey the truth?"

Ard. As we were engaged in conversation about the privileges we had enjoyed at the house Beautiful, a very fine spoken man overtook us, and entering into the same subject, said he was sent out to accompany us a little way, and show us still greater things.

Ste. I know him: he is one of the Flatter-wells. He has cast down many wounded; yea, multitudes have been slain by him. But you must have neglected

your books, or forgotten to watch and pray. For those who are careful to keep their own hearts, seldom fall into his hands.

Th. We did neglect both. And our deliverance from him is to be ascribed to Him who is stronger than all. For he had led us nearly to the top of the tower of Spiritual Pride, when he fell himself, and was dashed in pieces.

Ste. It is well that you did not fall too. Many have been decoyed to the top of that tower, and been pushed off upon the sharp rocks below. Some have been caught in a net, and others have been thrown into a pit. I know not that any true pilgrim has ever been destroyed there; but many have been greatly injured, sometimes to the breaking of their bones, so that they went lame all their life after. Moses, though the meekest man that ever lived, once got a fall there, so that he was disabled from leading the Israelites into Canaan. Peter was there dreadfully entangled in a net, so that he denied his Master for fear. Paul was once in great danger from that place, and was prevented from mounting the tower by having a thorn stuck into his flesh. The three friends of Job were so entangled that Job had to help them out. And even Job himself seems to have mounted several steps of that dangerous tower. Many of the scribes and Pharisees have been thrown down from the top of that tower, and dashed in pieces. Diotrephes lost his life there. And many who have been thought excellent pilgrims while on the way, have been led up to the top, and thrown down. But it has usually been discovered afterwards that they had not come in by the wicket gate.

Ard. It is well then that this Flatter-well has come to his end, so that no more pilgrims will be decoyed by him.

Ste. The Flatter-wells are a numerous family, which is not likely to become extinct while the world stands. Many of them have been cut off, from time to time, but others are ready to take their places. And there is no part of the pilgrim's path which is free from their intrusions. Their great ancestor himself, is still alive, and as actively employed as ever, in decoying pilgrims from the right path. It was he that seduced our great mother in paradise; and he had the boldness to try his art upon the Prince Immanuel himself; but on him he could not prevail. There is another tower, very much like the one you mounted, called the tower of Vain Glory, which has destroyed yet greater numbers. It stands near the town of Vanity, (through which you are to pass,) on a high mountain called Worldly Grandeur. King David was once led up that tower by old Flatter-well himself, and got a terrible fall. King Solomon was led up there, till Polygamy caught him in her net, and Idolatry bound him hand and foot with her strong cords. Nebuchadnezzar had such a fall there as deprived him of his reason, and Belshazzar lost there both his life and kingdom. Pharaoh the Great fell from the top of that tower into deep waters, and sunk to the bottom like a stone. And the Herod who imprisoned Peter, had his head so turned, by mounting that tower, that he fancied himself a god, and was not undeceived till he found himself eaten of worms, and gave up the ghost.

Th. We found our heads very much affected by the height to which we mounted; and after we

got down, we were troubled with a pain in the breast, and distressing faintness. But since we descended into this valley, we have found ourselves much relieved.

Ste. The air of this valley gives great relief in such cases; and indeed in all those disorders to which pilgrims are subject. But unless you take some proper medicine, you will be likely to feel the ill effects of your ascent, for a long time. The pain in your breast, was in consequence of your breathing the thin air at so great a height; your lungs were filled with it. And the faintness is a symptom of the disease called *Self-dependence*, a complaint to which pilgrims are exposed on all high grounds, and greatly prevails in the vicinity of that tower.

Th. Can you give us any thing that will cure us of this disease?

Ste. A perfect and lasting cure seldom if ever takes place this side of the river which terminates your journey. But I have a medicine which often gives relief when the fit comes on. It is called *Backslider's pills.* The principal ingredient is the herb *Self-loathing*, which grows everywhere in this valley. A handful of this, with a small quantity of *Self-knowledge*, and a few grains of *Consideration*, being compounded together, and moistened with the water of *Contrition*, makes a box of them. Two or three of these pills, taken fasting, will give relief in most cases; or prevent a fit from coming on, if taken seasonably. Their first operation produces a sense of weakness through the whole frame; but that is very soon followed by the same composed, agreeable sensation, which is felt on breathing the air of this valley. They are at first a little disagreeable to the taste, but habit soon renders them pleasant.

So he gave the pilgrims each a box of these pills; and having taken some, according to his directions, they soon felt their happy effects. And in a little time, refreshments being brought in, they sat down with their host, and partook of his fare, which they found very sweet to their taste. Then, as the day was far spent, Stephanas invited them to stay with him till the next day, which they willingly consented to do. They then sat down, and resumed their conversation, as follows:

Ste. Did the men, with whom you parted at my door, come in your company all the way from the side of the Hypocrite's Hope, to this place?

Ard. No. They came with us to the village of Careless, where they stopped to hear Mr. Self-conceit preach, being invited by one of the inhabitants, who extolled him as one of the finest preachers in the world.

Ste. Why did not you stop too? Were you not also invited?

Ard. Yes. But we had seen him before, and had no inclination to hear him.

Ste. Where had you seen him?

Ard. While we stood near the cross, he came by; and seeing us much affected at the sight, he began to call us poor, deluded creatures; and tried to make us believe that he who died on it was nothing but a man like ourselves.

Ste. Perhaps it is well for you that you first met him there, when he showed himself in his true light. He imposes upon many by his good words and fair speeches. He pretends to so much liberality of sentiment, and to such charitable feeling towards all men, that he blinds the minds of numbers

to his true character, and they little suspect him to be an enemy to the Lord of the way. His preaching, for the most part, is very smooth, both in matter and manner, and most of what he says in his sermons is capable of an interpretation which is consistent with truth. His great art is, to keep the distinguishing truths of Christianity out of sight, and not to give any alarm by bringing forward his errors; that thus he may lull suspicion asleep, while he leaves the mind uninstructed and ready to embrace any error he may think prudent to insinuate. Meanwhile, he endeavors to lower down the estimation in which the advocates of truth are held, by calling them good, but weak men; well meaning, but not very enlightened: while he embraces every occasion of praising up those of his own sentiments, as great, and good, and learned, and liberal, and the like. Real pilgrims who hear him preach, usually discover that there is something wanting in his sermons; they are not fed with the sincere milk of the word: but if they are not well instructed before, they are not very likely to discover what the matter is; and are often imposed upon by those professions of charity which are ever on his tongue. He cries down doctrinal preaching, and religious controversy, because he knows his own sentiments will not bear examination. And he cries up what he calls practical preaching, because he knows that all men, whether Christians, or heathens, or Mahometans, or Jews, believers or unbelievers, will speak favorably of a good moral life; and according to their own construction of the phrase, will be in favor of [illegible] preaching. But you will find more of the same fraternity in the town of Vanity, if you stop there. Your late fellow travellers were well pleased with his preaching, I suppose.

Th. I should conclude so, from what I know of their sentiments; but we did not ask them. We did not meet with them again, till we came into this valley, when they came in by the road that enters this from the left hand.

Ste. Then they called at the new house, just at the top of the hill Difficulty, which is kept by Hypocrisy and her sisters. Most of those who come into the way by the stile of the Hypocrite's Hope, call at that house; and they inveigle some true pilgrims too, and by their arts get them under their influence for a time. How did you escape them? They seldom let any pass without trying to persuade them to go in.

Ard. We did not entirely escape them. For I was so inconsiderate as to be inclined to go in, at the first invitation, and urged my brother with me against his better judgment.

Th. And I consented to go in, while yet I was not satisfied that it was the right house.

Ste. You were both to blame. You should have consulted your books, and taken heed to the directions contained in them. But how did you get away? Why did they not prevail upon you to take the left hand path?

Th. We were not pleased with their conversation in the evening; and so after spending the night in reading our books, and in crying to our King for forgiveness and direction, we left the house as soon as it was light in the morning, without regarding the cries of the porter, and not having seen the mistresses of the house.

Ste. You have great reason to be thankful for your delive-

rance. It is not often that any get out of their hands with so little trouble. For though they profess unbounded charity, and liberality of sentiment, and a willingness to let every one choose freely his own place of entertainment, and disclaim the idea of retaining any against their will, all this is intended to influence travellers to come to their house, and to persuade them to stay contentedly. But if any seem to manifest a wish to get away from under their influence and control, the whole family is at once roused to oppose it. All the arts of flattery, persuasion, and intreaty, are made use of, and every obstacle which can be invented, is thrown in their way. And if, after all, any will abandon them, he is sure to incur the displeasure of the whole family; and to be followed, through the whole of his journey, with the most unkind insinuations and reports against his character. But, come, tell me all your adventures since you set out, and how you came to set out on pilgrimage.

So Thoughtful and Ardent related to Stephanas their whole history; and then begged the favor of hearing from him a relation of his own, to which request he readily assented.

BUNYANUS.

For the Christian Magazine.

MEANS ESSENTIAL TO THE PERSEVERENCE AND SALVATION OF SAINTS.

THE scriptures very clearly teach us that all true saints will eventually be saved. Nor do they less clearly ascribe their salvation to God. But while they teach the certainty of their salvation, and the fact that this is the effect of divine agency, they also assure us that in accomplishing this important object, God makes use of means:—means which as evidently involve the activity and exertions of saints themselves, as the appointment and result of them do the design and agency of God. It is the object of the present communication to show that God, in securing the perseverence and salvation of saints, makes use of means. I shall not, however, attempt to enumerate all the means which God employs for this important purpose; but a few in which the agency of saints themselves, as well as of God, is evidently concerned.

To the Ephesians the Apostle Paul says, "By grace are ye saved, *through faith;* and that not of yourselves it is the gift of God." It is worthy of notice, that in this passage, in which the salvation of men is expressly ascribed to God, *faith*, an exercise which implies their own agency, is mentioned as the *means* by which this work is accomplished. The same thing is mentioned in the following words of Peter, as the means by which God secures the perseverance and salvation of his saints. "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you, who are *kept by the power of God*, THROUGH FAITH *unto salvation.*" Here we learn that *faith*, an exercise in which they are active, voluntary, and free, is the means by which God preserves saints in the path of life. His Spirit, by producing faith in them, and exciting them to the performance of all its attendant duties, leads them on in the way

to heaven. As they are kept through *faith*, whatever is essential to the existence of faith, and whatever is the necessary consequence of faith, are included in the means by which God saves them. Assuming this as a truth, we may observe,

1. That God in saving believers, or saints, inclines them to seek after divine knowledge. Without a knowledge of God, it is impossible that they should have faith in him. Without a knowledge of Christ, and of the way of salvation through him, they cannot exercise saving faith in his name. It is impossible for them to increase their faith, unless they grow in knowledge. And it is impossible for them to grow in knowledge, without making exertions to obtain it. In order, therefore, to the existence and increase of that faith, by means of which saints are preserved unto salvation, God inclines them to seek after divine knowledge. Their own activity and exertion in acquiring a knowledge of God, and of the duties which they owe him, is one of the means by which he preserves them from sin, and guides them into the path of duty and of safety.

2. Another means by which God saves believers is their own watchfulness. This is a duty which invariably attends the exercise of true faith. It is the nature of faith to render those who exercise it obedient to the commands of Christ. And watchfulness is a duty which he enjoins upon all his followers. As far, therefore, as they are under the influence of true faith, they will watch against the indulgence of evil thoughts, against evil speaking, and sinful conduct, against the temptations which the world presents before them, and the various devices of the grand adversary, the Devil. It is by means of this, that God enables them to see and escape the snares, in which their spiritual enemies hope to take them. It is a mistaken notion that God ever preserves them in the path of holiness, and conducts them onward safely to heaven, without their own watchfulness and sobriety.

3. The prayers of saints is another means, by which God preserves them in the path of life. Prayer is one expression of faith. It is one of its immediate, and invariable effects. No saint ever lives in the exercise of true faith, without being constant, and fervent at the throne of grace But prayer is a means, with which God has connected his choicest blessings. In answer to the prayers of saints, God gives his Spirit for their further light, sanctification, and comfort. By prayer, they maintain that intercourse with God which secures his friendship, and averts his displeasure. By prayer, they are assisted in obtaining a knowledge of their duty, and grace to perform it. In answer to their prayers, God's blessing attends their religious privileges, and makes them instrumental of increasing their knowledge and holiness. In answer to their prayers, God remits their sins, and saves them from the curse, to which all transgressors are opposed.

4. God secures the perseverence and salvation of his saints, by means of their exertions to promote the cause of truth and religion in the world. Their exertions in the service of God, have a tendency to increase all their holy exercises. When they are engaged, with all their hearts, in his service, they are less in-

clined than ever to indulge themselves in any species of sin. It is by engaging their hearts and employing their hands in doing good, that God most frequently prevents their doing evil. These services of his, which are connected with a glorious reward, are among the means by which he keeps them from those sins, which expose them to punishment. Those whom God designs to save, he inclines to activity in his service. The various ways in which they can promote the cause of religion in the world, are so many means which God employs to secure their perseverance and salvation.

It is as certain that God will use *means* to save saints, as it is that he will save them. And the means which he will employ for this purpose, we may rest assured, are such as are well suited to accomplish it. As it is by *faith* that he keeps them unto salvation, we know that the means which he will use with them are such as are suited to excite, and cherish, and strengthen their faith. He will not produce faith in them without a knowledge of the Saviour, and while they have no sense of their need of him. But he will influence them to *consider* their perishing condition without a Saviour, and thus prepare their minds to seek after him with great earnestness and importunity. He will not strengthen their faith in the Saviour, without any knowledge of his promises, or evidence of his faithfulness; but he will influence them to *search the scriptures*, to *meditate* upon his promises, and to *consider* the instances in which his faithfulness has been tried and found unfailing.

He will not give them light, and strength, and spiritual comfort whether they desire these blessings or not, or whether they do any thing to obtain them or not; but he will make them deeply sensible of their *need* of these things, and influence them to pray for them with deep sincerity, and with a fervour and perseverance which will ensure success.

He will not preserve them from the enticements of an ensnaring world, and the devices of a subtil adversary, when they are cherishing a worldly spirit, and heedlessly placing themselves in the way of temptation. But he will, by his Spirit inspire them with a *hatred* to the world, and with a fear of its snares; with a cordial opposition to the works of the Devil, and with a deep anxiety to escape his wiles, that shall render them habitually *watchful*.

He will not promote their growth in grace, while they are indulging themselves in sloth and idleness in religion. But he will *awaken* them to activity—he will make them feel their *obligation* to exert themselves in his service—he will place before them motives the best suited to arouse them to action, and by the operations of his Spirit frequently render these effectual to their increased engagedness and activity.

I would not be understood by any thing which I have here advanced, to intimate that God will always keep his saints in the path of duty. We know, both from observation, and from plain intimations in the scriptures, that they do sometimes fall. But "though they fall, they shall not be utterly cast down." God will influence them habitually to walk in his statutes, and cause their path before them to be "as the shining light that shineth more and more unto the perfect day." He will render even the sins which they occasionally commit

the means of increasing their humility, of teaching them more effectually their dependance on him, of giving them a more thorough knowledge of the evil of transgression, and of rendering them more circumspect and watchful.

A.

[To be continued.]

For the Christian Magazine.

THE CAREER OF FASHION IN IMITATION OF THE GREAT.

MEN professing religion, and their wives, and their children, frequently think that they must imitate the great of this world. But, they think little of the danger of their course. If you *will* follow the great of this world in their dress, in their equipage, in their parties, in their amusements, in their general principles and conduct, you are forever undone. This is the highway to hell. This is that broad way to destruction in which great men, and would-be-great men, and little men, all go down to hell together.

MINUS.

From the New York Observer and Chronicle.

Let no man deceive you with vain words: for because of these things cometh the wrath of God upon the children of disobedience. Eph. v. 6.

DO PEOPLE GO FROM THE THEATRE RIGHT TO HEAVEN?

A little group of children were gathered around their father, by the parlor fire, while he read aloud a paragraph in the newspaper. It was *just fifteen years ago*, and the topic was *the burning of a Theatre!* A gentleman who witnessed the terrific scene, and who had lost several friends among *the seventy-five* who perished in that memorable conflagration, was describing the dreadful facts of the case, in a letter to a friend which had been published, and which the father of the circle was reading and explaining to his interested audience. Soon the narrative told of a young lady, whom that gentleman endeavored to rescue from the flames, when a dark volume of smoke rolled between them, and separated him from the lovely object of his sympathy, whom he saw no more:—that volume became her shroud!

As soon as this catastrophe had employed the pen of the narrator, he abruptly exclaimed, with a too familiar use of the *highest name*, "O my lovely J——! but why do I grieve? she is now an angel in heaven; and if"—— here one of the children who had been listening with wrapt attention to the recital, seemed much affected. Her father paused; others turned their attention to the sympathetic little sister, in whom, however, sensations of tenderness seemed yielding to those of surprise, when she disburdened her spirit, and relieved the anxiety of all, by inquiring, "*Why, pa? do people go right from the Theatre to Heaven?*" The effect of this interrogatory may be conceived. To the unsophisticated querist the thought seemed rather paradoxical!

In any real instance, we feel that it is not ours decisively to answer the question. But the question is properly impersonal. It implicates the principle, mainly, that *there is an awful incongruity between the Theatre and Heaven.* Nor may we resolve the question into the simplicity of its author. It is the common and

the immemorial conviction of the virtuous, that the stage is a system whose moral influence is at war with Heaven. Just in proportion as enlightened and principled men have become acquainted with the Theatre, with the facts of its history—has their unanimous reprobation been awarded? What the vicious applaud is only condemnation. Such an incomparable person as Sir Matthew Hale, "in whom our British Themis gloried, with just cause," denounces the Theatre as a school of sin, and the portal of perdition. He was neither *puritan*, *priest*, nor *partisan;* but one of the best judges in the case, the world ever saw;—the peerless glory of British jurisprudence, an observer of men, a philosopher of facts, and one whom specious error could seldom or never mislead.

It is my own conviction, Messrs. Editors, that *an habitual attendant at the Theatre, cannot, without general and special repentance, go to heaven at all:* and that, though "many there be" who scoff at the sentiment, it is one in which all real christians are united.

PHILODEMUS.

For the Christian Magazine.

INQUIRIES RESPECTING SUBMISSION.

I HAVE just read, for the first time, Messrs. Editors, the remarks of *Senex*, in your number for November, on some objections to submission: which remarks were first published in the Utica Repository. I do not wonder that old men should sometimes feel provoked at the assurance, and positive self-confidence, of young men. The proper place for a young man is sitting at the feet of the old, asking *questions*, and receiving instructions. I hope your venerable correspondent *Senex*, will suffer me to take my place at his feet, and propose a few humble inquiries. I beg leave to premise, that I know nothing of S. who had said some pretty positive things on this subject.

If I rightly understand the views of *Senex*, he has undertaken to answer the question, "*when* ought a regenerate person, or real christian, to be willing that God should destroy him in a future state?" And the answer is briefly this, "when such a person does not *know* that he is renewed." And this knowing, seems not to mean positive certainty; but to be limited and explained by another expression, "he sees no evidence of being a subject of saving grace" —that is, he has "no hope." The subject of this submission must be, at the same time, a subject of absolute *ignorance;* ignorant of an important fact, *viz.* his *conversion;* the fact that "old things have passed away and all things are become new." Now in view of this, several inquiries arise.

1. Does God *require* this ignorance? Is there any precept of the Bible which *enjoins* it on a new creature, as an imperious duty, that for a certain length of time, he must "not know his own self?"

2. Has God made this ignorance necessary? Is it one of the means of grace, one of the terms of acceptance with God, or a necessary part of the process of obtaining a "good hope through grace?"

3. Is it a *fact*, that "*every one* who is born of God," is left for a time without any evidence that he is a subject of saving grace?

And if God has not *required* this ignorance which is essential to unconditional submission, then

4. Can it be believed that God

has *required* the consequent submission?

And if this ignorance is not, on the plan of God's dealings with new creatures, made necessary to salvation, then,

5. Can it be believed that the submission which follows it, is necessary to salvation?

And if not, then,

6. Are not those Ministers who preach that this submission is essential, laying a yoke on their people which God has not laid on them?

And if there are any who are renewed creatures, and have never been the subjects of this ignorance, then,

7. Are there not some who *ought not* to have felt this submission which is founded on such ignorance?

Senex says—"It is granted that present submission is inconsistent with present disobedience." Now impenitence is disobedience.

8. Does not the submission of the new creature, however much in the dark respecting the nature of his exercises, absolutely forbid his being willing to remain impenitent another moment?

Every one knows that it is God's purpose, that the impenitent only shall be destroyed in a future state—therefore,

9. Does not unconditional willingness to be destroyed in a future state, implying, of necessity, a willingness to remain impenitent, destroy itself?

Senex says, "Supposing God had told Lucifer, the day before he disobeyed, I have determined that to-morrow you shall disobey; ought not Lucifer to have said, from the heart, I submit?"

I have always understood from my Fathers, that the Law, or precepts of God, require absolute perfection of all intelligent creatures. If so, then the purpose of God, that Lucifer should disobey, was in direct *opposition* to the precept, —"be perfect." And I have heard old men say, that all the purposes of God, respecting the existence of moral evil, or whenever they render any moral evil certain, are, and must be, in opposition to his precepts.—If so, then,

10. Which shall we make the rule of our duty—that is, of all our affections and exercises,—God's precepts, or his purposes? Is it not clear that both cannot be? And if the precept is the rule, then,

11. Would not the most heartfelt opposition, on the part of Lucifer, in the case supposed, against disobedience, the very thing which God had decreed, constitute the very highest act of obedience to the rule—the precept, and render him the most lovely and holy in the sight of God?

I trust, that, whatever knowledge your correspondent, Senex, may have, that I am "a fool," will not lead him to forget, that it sometimes becomes a wise man to "answer a fool," and that he will listen to my inquires so long as I acknowledge and feel that I am

JUVENIS

From the Utica Christian Repository.

ON THAT MORAL STATE OF MIND WHICH LEADS MEN TO EMBRACE THE DOCTRINE OF UNIVERSAL SALVATION.

IT has been remarked, in relation to the manner in which the mind forms its religious opinions, that the heart governs the man:—the affections predominate over the understanding. Mankind have a strong desire that the fact or event may correspond to their

hopes—And they will eagerly grasp at the least shadow of evidence which appears to be in their favor, and earnestly endeavour to believe *that* to be true, which is most agreeable to their wishes; while, from the influence of these same feelings, they are inclined to fortify themselves against any impression from an argument which has a tendency to prostrate those hopes which are so agreeable to their wishes, and which they so fondly cherish. And from this state of the mind, a belief of the truth of a sentiment will often arise without even a consciousness that the feelings have had any influence in leading to the decision. It has, therefore, been an old maxim, that a man's opinions are very much influenced by his wishes; and under this influence he will employ media of proof, to which an unsophisticated mind—a mind unbiassed by interest or prejudice would never think of resorting. His mind is not in a posture to receive truth on its own foundation, and supported by its own proper evidence.

The same extravagance and perversion of reason are discoverable in the advocates of the system of religion now under discussion, that is common to theorists generally.—It is an enthusiasm tinctured with wildness. Fancy and feeling, rather than unwarped and chastened judgment, give character to his reasonings, and determine his conclusions. It is not the spirit of sober inquiry, which calmly asks, "what is truth?" It is an ill directed and untamed zeal for the establishment and defence of a favorite scheme, or the prostration of an opposing one. But why does the Universalist want such a scheme? Why will he pervert the first principles of scripture and reason, and violate the plainest laws of interpretation for its support? The answer is ready. Ask the man of licentious life, who riots in forbidden pleasures, and casts off the restraints which a religion even in any form founded on the gospel, imposes:—ask such a man why *he* would fain persuade himself of the truth of this doctrine, and you need not wait for his answer. If he would find salvation himself, he must find it, either on the ground of universal salvation, or he must relinquish his sinful indulgences. Tell one of these that he may safely indulge his vicious propensities to any extent he chooses, and he will be satisfied.—He will not trouble you to contest with him the merits of Universalism or Calvinism; and seldom will he disturb his Bible or his own ease to investigate the truth of either.—But the examples alluded to, it may be said, are cases of extreme depravity. Still, however, they serve to illustrate a general principle, which is equally applicable to every man in whose bosom human passions reign, uncontrolled by the grace of the gospel. And the indulgence of these passions, in modification and degree however various, has but one general nature. It is uniformly sinful. And like the indulgence of those of stronger character, it affords a delight, the relinquishment of which, the subject would esteem no ordinary sacrifice.

But an unwillingness to relinquish sinful indulgences is not the only reason why men are disinclined to admit the generally received doctrines of revelation. Perhaps, indeed, it is not the strongest.—Tell an impenitent man that there is a fire which shall never be quenched; make

him believe this;—make him feel it, and you break his deepest slumbers; you intrude on his peace; you disturb a quiet, sweeter and more powerful than a Lethean draught. You make him see and feel that his eternal interests are in jeopardy. But tell him that salvation is equally and certainly secured to all, and you deepen his slumbers, and he rests in peace, perhaps, till the arch-angel's voice bids him rise and learn how fatal is his delusion! He delivers himself from the apprehension of endless punishment, and willingly believes there is no worm that never dies. With such a state of mind, it is not strange that men should form inadequate conceptions of the character and perfections of God. A limited view in this respect, is a natural consequence.—His mercy *must* supersede and obscure all his other moral perfections. Eternal justice is a fearful attribute. Sin too, becomes a light thing, and is stripped of the deep malignity of its nature. And the line betwixt virtue and vice, if indeed there be ground left for any such distinction, is faintly drawn.—I have but briefly noticed some of the subtile but powerful principles which operate on the Universalist. But, that this account developes the true causes, which lead to a belief in universal salvation, an accurate observation of life and character, can scarcely leave a doubt. Y.

SEVEN REASONS

Why we should not go to plays, balls, and parties of carnal pleasure.

1. Because no good can be derived from them. No one can honestly say he is too good to be mended. And as it is the object of God, in various ways to make the bad good and the good better, we ought to pursue the same noble object in all *our* plans and pursuits. But who ever grew wiser or better, by visiting a play or party of pleasure? Does not stubborn fact prove the contrary? Have not husbands and wives, children and servants been converted for the worse? Now, unless we possess the vanity and presumption to suppose we have naturally more virtue and fortitude than our neighbors, may we not be hurt as well as others?

2. Because time may be better employed.—Time is an invaluable talent. And can we set so little by it, and have so small a sense of our responsibility to God, as to squander it away? I have heard of a heathen emperor killing troublesome insects, to pass away the time which hung heavily upon him. But, I presume, if we conscientiously perform all the public and private, personal and relative duties of life, we shall find little time left to devote in imitation of the heathen emperor, much less to waste in the ball-room or theatre.

3. Because it is a misappropriation of money.—When every demand is answered in a family, in an ordinary case, even with the best economy, our stock of money will be nearly exhausted. But if there should be a trifling surplus, or we should have command of a fortune, there are other demands to be answered, before we are at liberty to waste our Lord's substance. Indeed, if any thing remain in our hands, after supplying our poor neighbors, whom God has sent to us with a check, we must return it with interest to the original owner.

4. Because we ought never to be found in bad company.—But

do not good people go to these places? It is granted that those are sometimes found there, who, according to their profession, ought to be found in better company.—But I have no opinion that a child of God will, of choice, meet with the worst of people, viz. thieves, gamesters, drunkards, pickpockets, and prostitutes. This promiscuous multitude is found at plays, &c. What regard can we be said to pay to the word of God, "Thou shalt not go with the multitude to do evil," if we frequent places of this description?

5. Because we must not set a bad example. As insignificant as we may seem, we have a connexion with the vast chain of beings in the universe; and our principles and examples may, in some respect, affect the principles, character and destiny of each link in this chain.—"One sinner destroyeth much good." If we waste our time, there will not be wanting many who will imitate us, as if impelled by the law of attraction. If our example is not so perfect a one as we could wish, let us be careful that we do not set a bad one.

6. Because Almighty God has forbidden it.—The commands and cautions of the Bible are so numerous on this subject, that it is difficult to make an appropriate selection. "If sinners entice thee to sin, consent thou not."—"Enter not into the path of the wicked, and go not in the way of evil men."—"Be not among wine bibbers, among riotous eaters of flesh."—"Abstain from all appearance of evil."—"Evil communications corrupt good manners."—"Young men likewise exhort to be sober minded."—"Let no corrupt communication proceed out of your mouth: neither filthiness, foolish talking, nor jesting."—"For every *idle word* that men speak, they shall give an account thereof in the day of judgment." In view of these solemn prohibitions of Jehovah, who can consume his time and money at plays and parties of carnal merriment.

7. Because we must soon die.—And who would meet death in a ball-room? or go from the theatre to the "judgment seat of Christ?" The interview which the Rev. Mr. Hervey had with a young lady in a coach, though familiar to every one, may always be introduced with profit, and in this place is very pertinent. Talking fast in praise of the theatre, she said, there was the pleasure of thinking on the play *before she went;* the pleasure she enjoyed *when there;* and the pleasure of *reflecting upon it* when in bed at night. When she was done, Mr. Hervey, in a very mild way, said, that there was *one pleasure more*, which she had forgotten to mention. She replied, "What can that be? Surely I have included every thing in the enjoyment beforehand, at the time, and afterwards." To which Mr. Hervey answered; "Madam the pleasure that it will give you on your *death-bed.*" She was struck with great surprise, had not a word to say, and the consequence was, she never went any more to the play; but followed those pleasures which would afford her satisfaction on her *death-bed.*—READER, GO AND DO LIKEWISE.

EFFECT OF LOTTERIES.

AN old man, well dressed, was recently brought before the Police at Philadelphia, charged with picking the pocket of a poor man,

a workman in a furnace. In answer to questions put by the Mayor, the prisoner declared, "that he was nearly sixty years of age—that he was reduced to poverty and desperation by gambling in lotteries—that he had within the last forty years spent twenty-three thousand dollars, or more than 500 dollars a year—and that he had never drawn a prize of any importance."

Religious Intelligence.

OUTRAGES AT THE SANDWICH ISLANDS.

Extract of a Letter from Mrs. Bingham, to a friend in Springfield, Mass. dated Oahu, March 1, 1826.

"As the present season for the return of foreign shipping drew near, the *tabu*, or prohibition forbidding lewd women visiting the ships was renewed—some who persisted in violating the *tabu* were taken into custody, and either sent inland under keepers, or more closely confined nearer the chiefs.—Contrasting this state of things with what was, but a little while since, so universally patronised, it was thought much was gained, and that this iniquity also, had received a serious check.

Just at this time, the schr. Dolphin, Capt. P. a government vessel, arrived from the enlightened and happy land of America. Many days had not passed before some of the late measures were most publicly and loudly denounced—the rescinding of the *tabu* was urged and *demanded*—threat succeeded threat—bitter railings were heaped upon the mission and the nation. But no serious disturbance was apprehended—the name of America was regarded by the rulers; and her sons, surely, could not sit down and deliberately calculate to find in her a foe.

But, my dear friends, a gross insult was at hand for the nation, and trials for the little band of sojourners among them.

On Sabbath last, at the hour for the public services for the afternoon, a company of seamen from the Dolphin, accompanied by two or three others from among the whale-ships, entered the enclosure of the royal establishment, where also the congregation of this village, consisting of nearly three thousand, regularly assemble, and four of them, ascending a flight of stairs, leading into an upper veranda of Karaimoku's new stone house, rudely entered the large hall where a considerable number of the most distinguished personages, were attending on the sick and languishing couch of their venerated chief. They were ordered out, but peremptorily refused; and forming themselves into a line, each with a club in his hand, demanded the accustomed means of licentious indulgence, threatening, in case of a refusal, to demolish the houses. Soon they began breaking in the windows along the side of the gallery.—Mr. Bingham was in the hall when they entered, consulting with the chiefs as to the most suitable place to address the congregation, then assembling; as the afternoon was too rainy to meet them as usual in the open air.

You may be surprised that all this was suffered, when there was the authority of the chiefs and the strength of the people so near at hand. It cannot be accounted for, but by considering their very great unwillingness to have any controversy with foreigners, and their over scrupulous fears of being accounted aggressors. How much the recent threats, that the schooner, though small, was mighty, &c. might have operated, at that moment, on their minds, we cannot say.

After having dashed in the windows, they descended into the yard, and brandishing their clubs, and talking loudly awhile there, made, in a body, for the yard and house of Mr. Ellis, occupied since Mr. E's departure, by ourselves, and adjoining Karaimoku's.—Mr. B. hastened, by another gate, to defend his family. I was within, with my little daughter and two native females. Seeing the approach of the rioters, I almost involuntarily bolted the door, and fled to the apartments

Mr. B. I did not perceive. He, ver, reached the door, at the mothey did, and finding it secure, pted to return again; but the , seizing him by the shoulders, l him violently about, raising clubs and declaring he should not e. The dashing of the glass of indow soon led me to feel that ouse would not be a security, , added to the piercing screams child, and the fear that Mr. B. their cruel hands, drew me, at from my retreat, feeling the ne- of being prepared for the worst. B. had effected his escape into her yard, but was most closely ed. I saw the crowd, but my was too indistinct to distinguish duals. Instantly, however, I the natives cry, Mr. B. had fal- nd hearing also, distinctly, heavy , and seeing the tumult very I experienced for a moment, the ing feeling that my friend was

But to my great joy, I soon t a glimpse of him, and in a few nts unbolted the door for him and hamberlain. For a hasty moment ngled our tears, wondering at the which allowed him to say, that t it all, not a hair of his head en injured. It appears that the growing more furious, one aimed w at his head, which, through goodness, was warded off by his lla still continuing in his hand, failed of its aim; while another a knife, aiming a blow, and say- 'You are the man, every day." people now rushed forward with and fell upon the rioters with ury, that their lives must surely been the forfeit, but for vigorous ons on the part of both chiefs and naries, to save them from death. s they had been secured. Capt P. wo or three midshipmen arrived. trength which his arm displayed e use of the cane and cudgel d him in earnest to quell the

t an additional party arrived, and ng our yard, commenced another upon the house. What was re- ng of the glass in the window he door, except one pane, was lashed in, with part of the sash. door was an uncommonly strong but the violence upon it, left lit- son to hope it would remain, a nt longer, a barrier between them and us. At this instant, when they seemed, as it were, upon us, without any reason which could be discovered, they turned their strength against each other, and one, with the same weapon with which he had endeavored to force the door, levelled his comrade to the ground and fled. The weight of the captain's arm was, by this time, felt among them; and commanding the living to take up the dead, as it then appeared, the territories were again cleared of them."

In the close of her letter, under date of March 9, Mrs. B. says—

"Our present state calls for the constant and lively exercise of every christian grace. In the history of this mission, we have seen the Great Enemy so often foiled *with his own weapons*, in his attempts to hinder the work of the Lord here, that we are waiting to see what God will do. O, that it might be with a becoming spirit! God's people know not our particular wants when they lift up their hearts to Him in our behalf. But let none cease their supplications. The blessed Spirit will make intercession, and "He, who knows the mind of the Spirit," will hear and bless."

The Mission at the Sandwich Islands is prosperous. More than *twenty thousand* of the Islanders are under the influence of religious instruction, and *as many hundreds* maintaining the duties of family and private devotion; and many individuals, among whom are the most distinguished persons of the nation, giving pleasing evidence of a radical change of heart, and a fitness for the fellowship of the churches.

From the mission press at the Sandwich Islands, there were issued during the year 1825, or about to be issued at the close of that year, tracts to the amount of 1,367,600 pages.

"In a riot at Lahina, from the crew of the English ship Daniel, of which" the public have had information, "and in a recent riot at Oahu, from American seamen, particularly of the United States schooner *Dolphin*, Capt. *Percival*, on account of the *Tabu*, prohibiting females from visiting the ship for the purpose of prostitution, the lives and families of the missionaries have been materially exposed. But God

has yet defended them, nor suffered a hair of their heads to be injured."

Mr. Bingham and Mr. Richards have each completed a translation of the gospel of Matthew into the language of the Islanders.

It is ascertained that the British government will not permit any increase of the number of American missionaries in Ceylon. All exertions for the establishment of a Mission College in this place by the American Board, are therefore for the present suspended.

There are at Constantinople *five hundred* Jews who now profess to believe in Christ, who are said to have come to the knowledge of the truth, through Jews to whom Mr. Wolff preached the gospel at Jerusalem.

In the *Hervey Islands*, which lie between 500 and 600 miles S. W. by W. from Tahiti, the principal of the Society Islands, the gospel has produced wonderful effects. It was carried there a few years since by native missionaries sent from the Society Islands. In *Barotenga*, one of the principal of these Islands, 1496 had received baptism previous to October last. The christians may be distinguished from others when collected in crowds on the shore by the neatness of their dress, and their orderly behaviour.

We have encouraging intelligence respecting the progress of christianity in Southern India, particularly in Palamcotfah. 1,100 families, dispersed throughout 126 villages, have forsaken their Idols, and entirely given up the distinctions of caste, and besides the numbers mentioned in previous accounts, 40 persons had been added to the church by baptism.

Miss. Herald.

There is an unusual attention to religion in Groton and Ware, Mass. in Richmond, Virginia; in Washington City; in Troy, Hoosick, and Brunswick, New York; and Bennington, Vermont.

Ordinations and Installations.

Dec. 13,—At Rochester, (Mattepoisett,) as colleague with Rev. Mr. LeBarron, Rev. ASAHEL COBB, recently from Andover. Introductory prayer, by Rev. Mr. Shaw, of Middleboro'. Sermon, by Rev. Dr. Codman of Dorchester. Ordaining prayer by Rev. O. Cobb, of Rochester. Charge by the Senior pastor. Hight Hand of Fellowship, by Rev. Mr. Hemenway, of Wareham. Address to the Church and Society, by Rev. Mr. Gould, of Fairhaven. Concluding prayer, by Rev. Mr. King, of Dartmouth.

Dec. 13,—Rev. CALVIN PARK, D. D., late Professor in Brown University, was installed Pastor of the Evangelical Congregational Church in Stoughton. Introductory prayer, by Rev. Mr. Ferguson, of Attleboro'. Sermon, by Rev. Dr. Emmons, of Franklin. Consecrating Prayer, by Rev. Mr. Storrs, of Braintree; Charge by Rev. Mr. Fisk, of Wrentham; Right Hand of Fellowship, by Rev. Mr. Burgess, of Dedham: Address to the Church and Society, by Rev. Mr. Cogswell, of Dedham; Concluding Prayer, by Rev. Mr. Gay, of South Bridgewater.

December 20,—Rev. THOMAS T. WATERMAN was ordained as Pastor of the Union Congregational Church and Society in Providence, R. I. Introductory prayer, by the Rev. Mr. Cobb, of Taunton: Sermon, from Matthew, XIth Chap. 12th verse—"*And from the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of Heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force,*" by the Rev. Dr. Beecher, of Hanover Church, Boston: Ordaining prayer, and imposition of hands, by the Rev. Mr. Williams of Attleboro'; Charge to the Pastor, by the Rev. Mr. Everest, of Windham, Conn. Right Hand of Fellowship by the Rev. Mr. Maltby, of Taunton; Address to the Church and people, by the Rev. Mr. Brown, of Kingston; and concluding prayer, by the Rev. Dr. Wight, of Bristol.

Dec. 27,—Rev. EDWARD BEECHER was ordained as Pastor of Park Street Church and Congregation, Boston. Introductory Prayer, by Rev. B. Emerson, of Salem; Sermon, by Rev. Dr. Beecher, of Boston, from Gal. i. 8, *But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel, &c.*; Consecrating Prayer, by Rev. Dr. Woods, of Andover; Charge, by Rev. Dr. Codman, of Dorchester: Right Hand of Fellowship, by Rev. S. Green, of Boston; Address to the Church and Society, by Rev. W. Fay, of Charlestown; Concluding Prayer, by Rev. S. Gile, of Milton.

To Correspondents.—ITINERATER is received.

THE

CHRISTIAN MAGAZINE.

BY MEMBERS OF MENDON ASSOCIATION.

VOL. IV. FEBRUARY, 1827. No. 2.

A LATE THANKSGIVING SERMON.

JER. IX. 23, 24.

Thus saith the Lord, let not the wise man glory in his wisdom, neither let the mighty man glory in his might: let not the rich man glory in his riches: But let him that glorieth, glory in this, that he understandeth and knoweth me, that I am the Lord which exercise loving kindness, judgment, and righteousness in the earth: for in these things I delight saith the Lord.

THE prophet in the beginning of this chapter, laments in tears the extreme sinfulness of his nation. He cries, "Oh that my head were waters, and mine eyes a fountain of tears, that I might weep day and night for the slain of the daughter of my people." He paints their abandoning iniquities in the blackest colors; and God confirms the truth of his description. "Shall I not visit them for these things? saith the Lord: shall not my soul be avenged on such a nation as this?" This was a prediction of the heavy calamities which God was just ready to bring upon them in their long captivity in Babylon. But they despised these predicted marks of the divine displeasure, and gloried in their own prosperity, security, and self-sufficiency. They felt sufficient to maintain their present prosperity and independence. But God tells them that all their glorying in themselves is vain and presumptuous. "Thus saith the Lord, let not the wise man glory in his wisdom, neither let the mighty man glory in his might, let not the rich man glory in his riches: But let him that glorieth glory in this, that he understandeth and knoweth me that I am the Lord which exercise loving-kindness, judgment, and righteousness in the earth: for in these things I delight, saith the Lord." To glory is to rejoice, and therefore the term is sometimes used in a good sense, and sometimes in a bad sense. It is used in both senses in the text. God both forbids and requires his people to glory or rejoice. He forbids them to glory or rejoice

in themselves, but requires them to glory or rejoice in Himself. The spirit of the text may be expressed in this general observation:

It is the duty of a nation, in prosperity, to rejoice in God, and not in themselves. I shall,

I. Explain what it is for a prosperous nation to rejoice in themselves.

II. Explain what it is for them to rejoice in God. And,

III. Show that this is their duty.

I. I am to explain what it is for a prosperous nation to rejoice in themselves.

1. It is to rejoice in their own national prosperity because it is their own, and superior to that of other nations. The Jews were God's chosen people, whom he promised to give great national prosperity, so long as they obeyed the commands he had given them for their good. Moses told them, "The Lord shall make thee plenteous in goods, in the fruit of thy body, and in the fruit of thy cattle, and in the fruit of thy ground, in the land which the Lord sware unto thy fathers to give thee. The Lord shall open unto thee his good treasure, the heaven to give the rain unto thy land in his season, and to bless the work of thine hand: and thou shalt lend unto many nations, and thou shalt not borrow. And the Lord shall make thee the head, and not the tail: and thou shalt be above only, and thou shalt not be beneath." While God continued to pour such rich blessings into their bosoms they rejoiced in their own national prosperity, because it was their own and because it was superior to the prosperity of the nations round about them, or to that of any other nation in the world. They rejoiced in their own prosperity, and in their own superior prosperity; which was glorying in themselves, and expressive of both their selfishness and vanity. And whenever any nation thus rejoice in their own prosperity, because it is their own, and because it is superior to that of other nations; they rejoice in themselves, and boast of their selfishness and vanity.

2. A people rejoice in themselves, when they ascribe their national prosperity to their own self-sufficiency. This is what the prophet warns the people of God against in the text. They rejoiced that they had *gained* their national prosperity, by their own exertions, and were still able to *maintain* it by their exertions. Individuals by expressing their own feelings, expressed the general feelings of the nation. "The wise man gloried and rejoiced in his wisdom; the mighty man gloried and rejoiced in his might; and the rich man gloried and rejoiced in his riches." It was the general feeling of the nation, that they had gained their superior prosperity, by their superior political wisdom, by their superior martial skill and courage, and by their superior wealth and independent resources. And they rejoiced, that by these means, they were able to maintain their superior prosperity, against all the attempts of the Babylonians, or any other hostile nation to destroy it. This was emphatically rejoicing in themselves, and boasting of their own superiority to all other nations in wisdom, wealth, and martial prowess. And when any nation in the day of prosperity, cherish and express such feelings, they rejoice in themselves, and discover their unreasonable selfishness and vanity. I proceed,

II. To explain what it is for a nation, in prosperity, to rejoice in God. Here I may observe,

1. It is to understand and know that God is the Governor of the world. This God himself says is to glory and rejoice in him. "But let him that glorieth glory in this, that he understandeth and knoweth me that I am the Lord." God is the Creator, and of course the Preserver and Governor of the world. As Creator, he has an original and independent right to exercise a supremé and universal superintendency over it: It belongs to him who made and upholds the world, to act as an absolute sovereign in governing it: He has a right to govern not only the *material*, but the *moral* part of the world. He has a right to fix the bounds and number the months of all the children of men. He has a right to raise up one nation and destroy another. He has a right to give prosperity to one nation and not to another. He has a right to dispense private and public, civil and religious favors as he pleases. He has a right to govern every person and every thing respecting every person, in the best manner to answer his own wise and holy purposes. This right to govern the world, he universally exercises, and actually governs the world as much as it is possible for him to govern it. And this, every nation and every person must understand and know, in order to rejoice in Him, as the Governor of the world, and the giver of every good and perfect gift.

2. For a nation, in prosperity, to rejoice in God, implies rejoicing not only that he governs the world, but that he displays his great and amiable perfections in governing it. This is that rejoicing which he requires and will approve. "Let him that glorieth, glory in this, that he understandeth and knoweth me that I am the Lord, who exercise loving-kindness, judgment, and righteousness in the earth: for in these things I delight, saith the Lord." The only reason we have to rejoice that God governs the world, is, that he displays his great and glorious perfections in governing it. In the display of these there is abundant reason to rejoice.

Here, in the first place, there is reason to rejoice in the judgment or *wisdom* God displays in the government of the world. He says in the text; that he exercises judgment in the earth. Judgment often signifies prudence, discretion, or wisdom. As judgment in the text stands distinguished from kindness and righteousness, it most naturally signifies wisdom. God certainly exercised wisdom in the creation of the world. Hence David cries, "O Lord, how manifold are thy works! in *wisdom* hast thou made them all." God displays the same wisdom in governing the world that he displayed in creating it. If he does not govern the world in wisdom, there is no reason to rejoice in his universal supremacy and dominion, but reason to regret that the world is in his hands. If God does not exercise his wisdom in giving prosperity to a person or people, they would have no ground to rejoice in their prosperity; for it might eventually prove a dreadful calamity. Unless God governs the world in infinite, unerring wisdom, there is no ground to rejoice in any dispensations of providence, for all things may, finally, terminate in perfect confusion and misery. But since he assures us that he does exercise judgment in the earth, and display the same wis-

dom in governing, that he has displayed in creating the world, every person and every nation have good ground to glory and rejoice in him at all times, and in all circumstances, whether of prosperity or adversity. His unsearchable wisdom which he displays in all the dispensations of providence, afford a ground for always rejoicing in him.

In the next place, there is reason to rejoice in the moral rectitude and perfect righteousness, which God displays in the government of the world. He knows all the relations which mankind bear to Him and to one another, can weigh all their interests in an equal scale, and is disposed to treat them all according to his moral, immutable rectitude. This he professes to do in the text. He says, "I am the Lord which exercise righteousness in the earth." He is the righteous Lord, who loveth righteousness, and displays it in all his conduct towards every person and every nation in the world. Though he treats the inhabitants of the earth very differently in ten thousand instances and in ten thousand respects; yet in the dispensations of providence, he regards the interest of every individual person, and of every individual nation exactly according to its real worth and importance, and never commits a single instance of injustice in any of the private or public blessings which he bestows, or which he withholds, or which he takes away. While mankind are committing ten thousand acts of injustice towards one another, he who is the governor of the world and judge of all the earth always does right. This is a good reason why we should always rejoice in the Lord, in the day of prosperity; for our prosperity, whether private or public, does not injure any other person or any other nation on the face of the earth. In the last place,

There is reason to rejoice in the perfect benevolence, which God displays in the government of the world. In this he would have every one glory and rejoice, for he glories and rejoices in it himself. Let him that glorieth, glory in this, that he understandeth and knoweth me, that I am the Lord that exercise loving-kindness, judgment, and righteousness in the earth: for in these things I delight, saith the Lord." God is good, and doeth good; he is good unto all, and his loving-kindness and tender mercies are over all his works. He is not grudgingly good, but spontaneously good; it is his delight to do good in all the dispensations of providence. He every day and every moment fills the earth with his goodness. He giveth life, and breath, and all things. He displays his goodness every where, and towards every person and every nation in every part of the world. He is continually doing as much good as his wisdom, his justice, his power, and his goodness enable him to do. He removes every evil that it is best to remove, and bestows every mercy that it is best to bestow. "The Lord reigneth, let the earth rejoice, let the multitude of isles be glad thereof." But this leads us to show,

III. That this is the duty of all mankind, especially of every nation in the day of prosperity. And,

1. Because God has given them all their national prosperity. If they have wise men among them, God has made them wise. If they have mighty men among

them, God has made them mighty. If they have rich men among them, God has made them rich. If they have good men among them, who understand and know that the Lord exercises loving-kindness, judgment and righteousness in the earth, God has made them good. God has given them all their wisdom, all their power, all their wealth, all their piety, and all their temporal and spiritual prosperity. He has taken pleasure in giving them all these good things, for in these things I delight, saith the Lord. In whom then ought a people in prosperity to glory and rejoice? In themselves? or in God? If they rejoice, let them rejoice in God. If they glory, let them glory in God. If they boast, let them boast in God, to whose loving-kindness and tender mercy they are indebted for all their prosperity.

2. It is the imperious duty of a prosperous nation to rejoice in God, because he only, in his governing goodness, can promote and preserve their prosperity. As God displays his wisdom, power, and goodness, in raising a nation to prosperity, so he must continue to exercise the same glorious perfections in raising their prosperity higher and higher. A young nation especially need to grow in wisdom, power, wealth, and piety. But their growth, in all these respects, depends upon the same almighty and benevolent Being who gave them their prosperity at first. Unless they rejoice in him, they have no ground to expect that he will foster and promote their future prosperity. When God raised his ancient, chosen people to a state of superior prosperity, he plainly told them that he would continue to smile upon them, so long as they continued to rejoice in him, and to obey the commands he had given them for their good, but threatened to frown upon them, if they became ungrateful and disobedient. The more a prosperous people rejoice in God, the more thankful they are for his favors, and the more obedient they are to all the intimations of his will, the more reason they have to hope, that he will continue their prosperity. Besides, the more prosperous any nation is, the more they are exposed to national enemies, who will wish and endeavor to destroy their prosperity. This was the case of the Jews in their prosperity. This was the case of the Greeks in their prosperity, and this was the case of the Romans in their prosperity. In the course of providence, God has actually destroyed the great prosperity, which each of these nations once enjoyed, and he has done this in all cases by the instrumentality of their national enemies. God has always employed one wicked nation to destroy another. Every prosperous nation is in danger of losing their prosperity. Whenever God sees fit to destroy the prosperity of an ungrateful, disobedient nation, he can raise up their enemies, who will rejoice to do the work. It is, therefore, the duty and interest of a nation in prosperity, to rejoice in God, and engage him to protect and defend them against all their national enemies.

It now remains to apply this subject pertinently and plainly.

1. We have seen what it is for a people, in prosperity, to rejoice in themselves and to rejoice in God, and that these two kinds of rejoicing are entirely opposite to each other; the one is right and the other is wrong, the one is pleasing and the other displeas-

ing to God. God is pleased when a nation ascribe their prosperity to him, and rejoice in the wisdom, power, justice, and goodness, which he displayed in raising them to temporal and spiritual eminence among the nations of the earth. But he is greatly displeased if they rejoice in themselves, and ascribe all their prosperity to their own wisdom, power, wealth, and piety. If this be true, are not we as a prosperous nation verily guilty of a great national sin, in rejoicing in ourselves, and ascribing our peculiar prosperity to our own exertions? Have we not ascribed our national independence to the wisdom of our wise men? Have we not ascribed our federal constitution to the wisdom of our politicians? Have we not ascribed the administration of our national government to our wise rulers! Have we not ascribed our national transactions with foreign nations to the political skill of our statesmen and ambassadors at foreign courts? Have we not ascribed to our mighty men of valor, the battles we have fought and the victories we have gained by sea and land? Have we not gloried in our wealth and independent resources for carrying on war with foreign nations? Have we not gloried in our numbers, and presumed to calculate to how many millions we shall increase in a century, or half century more? Have we not boasted of our mechanical knowledge and invention, in building ships and steam boats, and preparing the munitions of war and self-defence? And have we not sometimes gloried in our national goodness, virtue, and piety? Who can read the numereus Eulogiums, which have been made and published upon our national wisdom, wealth, power, influence, goodness, and independent prosperity and security, without seeing and lamenting our national selfishness and vanity? Hence,

2. Have we not reason to fear, that our national prosperity will be followed with national calamities and desolating judgments? God has certainly seen how much we have rejoiced in ourselves, and boasted of that prosperity, which he has displayed his power, and wisdom, and goodness, to grant us. These things have been highly displeasing to him; and will he not say in respect to us, as he did to ungrateful, disobedient, and boasting Israel; "Shall I not visit for these things? shall not my soul be avenged on such a nation as this?" We have long acknowledged, that God almost wrought miracles in giving us our independence and subsequent prosperity. But it will require no such signal interpositions of providence, to diminish our wealth, our numbers, our strength, our civil and religious liberties, our peace and harmony, and to throw us into national discords, and involve us in all the miseries of domestic and foreign wars. There are great and powerful nations now, who look upon our prosperity with an evil eye, and they may soon think it is policy to interrupt and destroy, if possible, our growing power, which we have so often boasted of exercising over the civil and religious world. We are evidently in danger from Britain, France, and Spain, as well as from the hostile natives of our own country. France and Britain have both employed these savages to annoy us, and may do it again. But allowing that we have wisdom and power enough to awe our enemies, or to defend our-

selves against them; God can find ways enough to punish us for our national ingratitude and abuse of his favors. There is danger to be feared, I imagine, from the union which has lately been established among four or five denominations of Christians, for the good purpose of checking the growth of Infidelity and many gross and dangerous errors in the United States. It would not be strange if these different denominations should fall out by the way, and one should gain an ascendency over all the rest, and bring about the establishment of a National Religion. There is, however, more dangers to be feared at present, from the neglect of family government, family religion, public worship, and the profanation of the Sabbath, than from any other, and all other vices and immoralities that abound. These strike at the root of all order, government, and religion. And the criminality of these is highly aggravated, by our national prosperity.

This subject now calls upon all good men to perform the duty of thanksgiving and praise. There are no others prepared to keep this thanksgiving day properly and acceptably. They have never been thankful for any private or public, civil or religious favor. They have always rejoiced in themselves and gloried in their own self-sufficiency to gain all the good they have enjoyed. They are strangers to the least spark of gratitude to God, for any favor they have received from his kind and beneficent hand. The wise man has gloried in his wisdom, the mighty man has gloried in his might, the rich man has gloried in his riches, the young man has gloried in his vanity, and the vicious man has gloried in his shame. But good men have understood and known that God is the Lord and Governor of the world, who exercises loving-kindness judgment, and righteousness in the earth, and that he delights in filling it with his goodness, notwithstanding the general unbelief, ingratitude, and disobedience of mankind. They rejoice in God that he is good to themselves, and gives them all things richly to enjoy, and withholds no good thing from them. They rejoice in God, that he does good to the evil and unthankful. They rejoice in God, that he grants personal, family, and national prosperity. They rejoice in the Lord always, both in prosperity and adversity. They know that God is light, and in him there is no darkness at all. They know that he is constantly sowing light for the righteous, and joy for the upright in heart. They know the good he has promised to the children of light, and that his faithfulness shall never fail: Although the fig-tree should not blossom, nor fruit be in the vine, and the labor of the olive should fail, and the fields should yield no meat, yet they will have solid ground to rejoice in the Lord, and to joy in the God of their salvation. Now, why will not you who have always rejoiced in yourselves, be entreated to rejoice with them, who rejoice in the Lord? You must rejoice in the Lord in this world, or you never will rejoice in him in the next. And if you do not rejoice in him this thanksgiving day, some of you may never see another!

It will do you no good to be of the right religion, if you be not zealous in the exercise of the duties of that religion.—*Baxter.*

From the Christian Spectator.

EXEGESIS OF MATTHEW, XXIV. 29—31.

"IMMEDIATELY after those days of affliction the sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall withhold her light; and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the heavenly powers shall be shaken. Then shall appear the sign of the Son of Man in heaven; and all the tribes of the land shall mourn, when they shall see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven, with great majesty and power. And he will send his messengers with a loud-sounding trumpet, who shall assemble his elect from the four quarters of the earth, from one extremity of the world to the other."—*Campbell's Translation.*

The circumstances in which this prophecy was uttered, will serve to explain its import. After reproving the Pharisees for their pride and hypocrisy, their attachment to human traditions, and their opposition to his cause, Christ declared that God was about to punish them for their sins, and avenge on that generation "all the righteous blood shed upon the earth from the blood of Abel to the blood of Zacharias."* To this terrible denunciation he added the pathetic apostrophe—"O Jerusalem, Jerusalem! thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings; but ye would not! Behold, therefore, your house is left unto you desolate."†

After thus alluding to the calamities which awaited the Jews, Christ retired to the Mount of Olives, an eminence from which Jerusalem could be seen in all its beauty and magnificence.* Pointing to its splendid edifices, he said to his disciples, "there shall not be left one stone upon another." This alarming prediction led them to inquire when it should be fulfilled, and what signs would precede its fulfilment. As precursors of the event, Christ bade them expect false teachers and pretended Messiahs; war, famine, pestilence, and earthquakes; the apostacy of many Christians, the spread of his gospel, and a great variety of persecutions.† When they should see Jerusalem encompassed with armies, he assured them its destruction would be nigh, and exhorted its inhabitants to flee for refuge to the mountains.‡ After repeating some of these warnings, he proceeds to describe in the glowing language of prophecy, the destruction of that devoted city. "Immediately after those days of affliction, the sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall withhold her light; and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the heavenly powers shall be shaken. Then shall appear the sign of the Son of Man in heaven; and all the tribes of the land shall mourn when they shall see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven with great majesty and power. And he will send his messengers with a loud-sounding trumpet, who shall gather his elect from the four quarters of the earth, from one extremity of the world to the other."

To one who is familiar with the nature of prophetic language, the general import of this passage is too obvious to require

* Matt. xxiii. 1—33. † Matt. xxiii. 37, 38.

* Matt. xxiv. 1—3. † Matt. xxiv. 4—14.
‡ Matt. xxiv. 15—22. Luke xxi. 26

minute and elaborate criticism. The phrase, *immediately after the tribulation of those days*, and the corresponding expression in Mark,* *in those days after that tribulation*—εν εκειναις ταις ἡμεραις μετα την θλιψιν εκεινην— mean simply, that soon after the events mentioned as preceding the destruction of Jerusalem, "the sun should be darkened, and the moon withhold her light; the stars should fall from heaven, and the heavenly powers should be shaken." These are the expressions used in Hebrew poetry to denote the celestial bodies. The language, though bold and striking, corresponds with the ordinary style of Jewish prophets, who employ changes in the natural world to represent changes in the moral and political world. Isaiah thus describes the overthrow of Babylon:—

"The stars of heaven, and the constellations thereof,
Shall not send forth their light:
The sun is darkened in his going forth,
And the moon shall not cause her light to shine.
I will visit the world for its evil,
And the wicked for their iniquity.
I will make the heavens tremble,
And the earth shall shake out of her place."†

"*And then shall appear the sign of the Son of Man in heaven.*"—Those who were appointed by God to publish his will, proved their divine commission by uttering predictions, and performing miracles. The Jews expected the advent of their Messiah to be attended with supernatural events, peculiarly grand and awful, which they called signs from heaven;‡ and they frequently demanded such signs of Christ in support of his claims to the office of Messiah.* Such proofs he threatens, in this verse, to give them. The word translated *signs*, denotes any thing which proves a divine commission; it here refers to the prodigies which attended the destruction of Jesusalem, and means simply proof or evidence. A sign in heaven, is a conspicuous sign; a sign of the Son of Man in heaven, is conspicuous proof of his being the Messiah; and the whole phrase, therefore, means that Christ, in destroying Jerusalem, should vindicate his claims to the character of Messiah, and give awful displays of his majesty and power.—"*And then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn when they shall see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory.*" The phrase, *all the tribes of the earth*, —πασαι αι φυλαι της γης,—though often used to denote the whole human family, is occasionally applied, by way of eminence, to the inhabitants of Palestine.† This strong language, therefore, means simply, that the inhabitants of Judea should mourn when they saw the Saviour coming in all the terrors of an avenging God, amid the clouds of heaven. This figure is often employed by the Hebrew poets in describing the majestic movements of the Almighty; for when Jehovah came to deliver David, he is said "to bow the heavens and come down—to ride upon a cherub, and fly on the wings of the wind."‡ —"*And he shall send his messengers with a loud-sounding trumpet.*" Angels are messengers of God. The word is used by the sacred writers literally to designate the instruments of Provi-

* Mark, xiii. 24. † Isaiah, xiii. 10. 11, 13. Lowth's Translation.
‡ Dan. ii. 44. et. seg. vii 13. ix. 24—26. Josephus, B. I. c. 6.

* Matt. xvi. 1. Mark, viii. 11, 12. Luke, ix. 29. 1 Cor. i. 22.
† Zach. xiv. 11. Matt. v. 5. xxvii. 45. Eph. vi. 3. Joel, ii. 1.
‡ Ps. xviii. 9, 10.

dence, or figuratively to represent signal interpositions of Providence without specifying the agents employed.* A trumpet was the usual instrument for sounding an alarm, and summoning the people to resist invasion.† The angels, therefore, blowing their trumpets, and gathering the elect into places of safety "from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other," represent the special interposition of Providence to deliver Christians from those calamities which awaited the unbelieving Jews.

The whole passage, divested of its poetic costume, may be thus paraphrased:—Immediately after the events mentioned as signs preceding the fulfilment of this prophecy, Jerusalem shall be destroyed with a terrible overthrow. The Jews, when they see these calamities coming upon them, shall deeply mourn their fate; but Christians in every part of the land, shall by the merciful providence of God be delivered from these evils.

We come, then, to the conclusion, that this passage refers exclusively to the fall of Jerusalem, and the consequent calamities which befel the Jewish nation. This may be confirmed by the following considerations:

I. The passage forms a part of a prophecy which is supposed by all judicious commentators to foretel the destruction of Jerulem. The disciples asked when Jerusalem should be overthrown, and Christ in reply mentioned some signs which should precede this event, and added, that these signs of woe should be immediately followed by the destruction of that devoted city. There is no intimation, that the subject of discourse is changed; and the passage itself bears every mark of being a continuation of the prophecy which all refer to the fall of Jerusalem.

II. The context seems to decide the point. To show how closely the signs he had mentioned would be connected with the destruction of Jerusalem, Christ adds, in the very next verse, a parable drawn from the fig-tree. "When his branch is yet tender, and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is nigh. So likewise ye, when ye shall see all these things,—the signs which I have specified as precursors of this event,—know that it is near, even at the doors. Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled.* The men of that generation, then, were to witness the fulfilment of this prophecy. This language is unequivocal, and fixes the reference of this passage to the calamities which overwhelmed the Jews, when the Romans, about seventy years after the birth of Christ, took the city of their solemnities, burned its temple, and spread devastation through the land.†

III. If we examine the peculiarities of Hebrew poetry, and prophetic language, we shall find additional reasons for acquiescing in the conclusion to which we have arrived. To the writers of the New Testament the sacred poems of their nation were as "familiar as household words;" and, however simple their ordinary style, they always dressed their predictions in the splendid costume of prophetic poetry. Simeon had displayed no peculiar ardor of feeling, or vigor of fan-

* Matt. i. 20. xviii. 10. Acts, vii. 30. Heb. i. 7.

† Lev. xxv. 9. Numb. x. 2, etc.

* Matt. xxiv. 32—34.

† Josephus' War of the Jews, B. III—VII.

cy; but when he clasped the infant Saviour in his arms, he kindled into a blaze of enthusiasm and painted the prophetic visions which burst on his eye, in colors so bright and vivid, that the genius of Isaiah seemed to have risen from the slumber of centuries.* The prose style of John, has all the simplicity of nature; but when he comes to describe the future glories of the church, he dips his pen in the radiance of heaven, and transfers to the Apocalypse, all the bold and beautiful imagery of the prophets.

Examples of the poetic and prophetic style of the sacred writers might be multiplied without number; but I will add only one from the prophecy of Isaiah, respecting the fall of Babylon.‡ Jehovah, lifting a standard, musters the Median army, and leads "his consecrated warriors" forth to attack the devoted city. Its inhabitants are smitten with terror and amazement; its warriors are trampled down like mire, its children dashed on the pavements, and its streets drenched with blood. At this scene of war the earth is shaken from her place, and the luminaries of heaven are veiled in darkness.‡ Babylon is never more to be inhabited;—

"But there shall the wild beasts of the deserts lodge;
And howling monsters shall fill their houses;
And there shall the daughters of the ostrich dwell;
And there shall the satyrs hold their revels;
Wolves shall howl to one another in their palaces;
And dragons in their voluptuous pavilions."§ LOWTH.

The prophet then represents the Jews as chanting a song of triumph over the fallen monarch of Babylon. The earth, smiling in peaceful repose, breaks forth in acclamations of gladness; the trees of the forest clap their hands for joy; the ghosts of departed kings meet the tyrant with the bitterest reproaches, as he enters the world of spirits; and the song closes with fearful imprecations on his posterity, and on the city where he had swayed his sceptre of oppression and blood.* As the fallen despot enters the world of departed spirits,—

"Hades from beneath is moved because of thee, to meet thee at thy coming,
He moveth for thee the mighty dead, all the great chiefs of the earth;
He maketh to rise up from their thrones all the kings of the nations.
All of them shall accost thee, and shall say unto thee,—
Art thou, even thou too, become weak as we? art thou made like unto us?
Is then thy pride brought down to the grave; the sound of thy sprightly instruments?
Is the vermin become thy couch, and the earth-worm thy covering?
How art thou fallen from Heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning!†
Those that see thee shall look attentively at thee, they shall well consider thee;
Is this the man that made the earth to tremble, that shook kingdoms?‡ LOWTH.

This magnificent description was designed to represent that series of calamities which terminated in the total destruction of Babylon. But what were these calamities? History must inform us; and from it we learn, that Cyrus took the city, but spared its inhabitants, and left its walls standing; that Darius demolished its gates to prevent its becoming a nursery of rebellion; that Alexander found it so flourishing that he thought of making it the capital of his empire; that it gradually declined from its pristine magnificence, till, in the fifth cen-

* Luke, ii. 28—32. † Isa. chap. xiii. xiv. ‡ Isa. xiii. 2—20. § Isa. xiii. 21, 22.

* Isa. xiv. 5—27.

† Gesenius agrees with Lowth in the translation of this phrase; but *bright and morning star*, is more literal and exact. Hence the phrase in Rev. xxii. 16.

‡ Isa. xiv. 9—12, 16.

tury of the Christian era, it was converted by the kings of Persia, into a park for wild beasts, and ultimately became a heap of almost undistinguishable ruins.* The prophecy must, therefore, have been at least seven, and probably more than ten centuries in receiving its complete fulfilment.

To the construction we have put upon the prophecy of Christ respecting Jerusalem, it has been objected that its language is too strong to be applied to the destruction of a city or a nation. But if imagery so grand and awful as that which we have been examining, was used to describe events of less importance, is it strange that Christ employed language equally bold to predict an event the most disastrous that the Jewish annals ever recorded?

We shall more readily admit this conclusion, if we consider prophecy as a symbolical representation. The parables of Christ are symbols, and might be represented by a series of historical paintings.—Suppose a painter to employ his art in teaching the moral lesson contained in the parable of the prodigal son.† He might represent, in the first picture, the prodigal receiving his patrimony; in the second, wasting it in scenes of dissipation; in the third, feeding on husks, and famishing among swine; in the last, restored to the arms of his father, and the bosom of his family. Thus a battle, the destruction of a city, and the peculiarities of different nations are to be portrayed.

Let us apply this principle to the prophecy respecting Jerusalem.—The commotions, which are said to pervade all nature, are the symbols commonly employed by the prophets to represent great revolutions. The Son of Man riding in awful majesty through the heavens, and his angels sent forth to gather his chosen people beneath the banner of his love, are emblems of that deliverance which the christians in Judea actually obtained from the calamities that put an end to the Jewish nation.

I am aware, that various opinions have been adopted respecting the import of the passage under consideration.* Some refer it solely to the day of judgment; while others suppose it to relate, in its plain and primary signification, to the overthrow of Jerusalem, but in its mystical and secondary sense, to the day of judgment. The second opinion involves the long disputed doctrine of a double sense; a principle in sacred hermaneutics, which has been adopted by most commentators since the time of Origen, and which is still retained by the greater part of English critics, though it has long since been discarded by the ablest scholars on the continent.† All these points deserve a thorough examination; but each topic would require a separate article; and my limits, therefore, force me to omit not only these, but the well known fulfilment of this prophecy,‡ and a variety of interesting topics which it suggests.

R. Naman.

* See an enumeration of these in Kuinoel Com. in loc..; Wolfii Curæ h. l.

† See a very candid and ingenious defence of this principle in Lowth's Lecture on Hebrew Poetry, Sec. XI., and a brief refutation in the notes by Rosenmuller and Michaelis, as well as in Ernesti, Morus, &c.

‡ Newton on the prophecies, Diss. XVIII —XXI. Kett's View of Scripture Prophecies, ch. X.

* Gesenius. † Luke, xv. 12—32.

For the Christian Magazine.

INDISCRETION IN THE PULPIT.

A PREACHER is the object of universal scrutiny. By profession, he is a teacher of piety, and the least deviation from the spirit of his office, tarnishes his character. The votaries of religion, regard him as entrusted with concerns vast as eternity; and they watch him, therefore, with an eye indicative of the deepest interest; while the enemies of the cross, triumph in the detection even of his smallest mistakes. Of the imperfections to which good preachers are subject, the most prominent, are the extreme of caution and that of indiscretion: the latter results in the greatest evil, but each has slain its thousands. The rash chieftain falls in ambuscade, the wary chieftain eludes the snare: the latter retains his station, though his brow can never, like the other, glow in sudden splendor. The extreme of caution, is like the dead calm; that of indiscretion, like the whirlwind and the storm: for the former produces in minds no emotion, while the latter stirs them up to the wildest enthusiasm.

Preachers are indiscreet who practice upon theories adopted without sufficient examination. For these theories may be erroneous. If so, the evil does not soon terminate; but swells like an inundation, and perhaps, overwhelms multitudes in ruin. To illustrate my meaning, transfer yourselves, for a moment, across the Atlantic, to North Britain, and to past ages. Imagine a large district of that country, to tremble under the voice of a single individual. Distinguished for piety and talents, he addresses the human mind, in a few instances, with unexampled eccentricity of manner, and by a fortunate casualty, it is attended with eminent success. A religious excitement follows—a whole community is in commotion—this new mode of address, is imitated by others with scrupulous exactness. Is the prospect auspicious? or is it like the scorching sunbeams that forebode the desolating tempest? There is a momentary splendor, but is there no indication that the sun of this encouraging prospect will set in gloomy night? The earnestness, the glowing fervor, here exhibited, is worthy of imitation by every preacher. The question, however, respects the principles of action. Not only this *celebrated* man practices on novel principles, but these principles are adopted by many imitators. One of them, for instance, is, that "all sinners are alike, and must therefore be treated alike." As a consequence, no regard is paid to age, circumstances, or education. All sinners alike! True, there are points, in which, the simpleton resembles the philosopher, the speechless infant, the man of grey hairs. But suppose it, therefore, to be adopted as a principle, that the same language must be spoken, to the young, and the old, the beggar, and the noble. The theory cannot sustain a moment's scrutiny. It has appendages however. It is found, in one case, that conviction is produced by exciting the angry passions; that depravity is disclosed, by calling it forth, in the most violent indignation; and what follows? This mode of convicting sinners is adopted as a universal principle. The influence of the example spreads from glen to glen; many who copy the favorite model, vie with each other, in their endeavors to excite human wrath. The first effort is successful—they ply

themselves to the work, with redoubled vigor. There is something so imposing in this method, that the brilliant luminary is followed by a train of sparkling imitators; and audacious childhood insults venerable age. But the meteor has set—The cold winds of winter *now* sweep along those glens. Is there no danger that some preachers in *our* country may practice on such indigested principles? If not, it is a golden age, and Zion shines in her most splendid beauty. But in other respects, preachers may adopt false principles. Origen was a preacher. He adopted erroneous principles of interpretation. Their influence was like the malignant vapor that blasts the choicest productions of the soil: for it filled the moral atmosphere, and shrouded the world in gloom. The process of its diffusion, was gradual, but its effect was terrible. It gave existence, and vigor to the enormous hierarchy of Rome. Had christian caution guided his pen, the world, perhaps, had never groaned under such a moral despotism. Thus the indiscretion of a single man, may desolate the earth for ages.

It is indiscreet to adopt the controversial method of preaching. It is *always* important to contend earnestly for the faith, and *sometimes* to declare open war against its opposers; but even this may be accomplished, without evincing a delight in the spirit of controversy. I would ask, and I speak it with deference; I would ask, if some ministers do not practice, as though *preaching*, were intellectual pugilism? One part of a discourse, for instance, is employed in *raising*, the other part, in *prostrating* an antagonist. If no real sectarians appear in combat, war is waged against those of the same creed, by the use of paradoxical expressions. Words only, in this case, are the weapons of contention. Uninformed hearers, however, may view the subject in debate to be a matter of vital importance, and the peculiar use of terms, may fix in their minds, an error as lasting as their earthly existence, and which shall be perpetuated by future generations. Nor is it certain that this spirit of controversy, will be *confined* within the precincts of a single parish. It may extend through a state, or a nation. There is a difference between plain reasoning, and this controversial method. The former should be approved, the latter exploded.

It is indiscreet to adopt the scolding method. This results in a three fold evil; it renders the preacher himself an object of aversion, confirms transgressors in more *violent* opposition, and robs religion of its most persuasive and attracting charms. Shall the herald of peace, present the brow of a misanthropist, instead of a countenance reflecting the splendor of heaven? Such a preacher rouses against himself, not the *depraved* principles merely, but also, the finest sensibilities of human nature—his hearers shrink from his presence, as from the winter's storm. By the same process, in which he renders himself an object of displeasure, he confirms rejecters of the gospel, in more violent opposition: for truth itself receives a tincture from the manner in which it is exhibited. Suppose a man attempts to disclose the beauties of a meek and humble disposition, while pride only occupies his own bosom. The humility which he commends, is deprived of its most charming attractions. A diamond dipped in ink, loses its lustre, and

is thrown aside by the multitude among the rubbish: Thus the pearl of heaven may be obscured, by the clouded brow of the preacher, and the method in which he exhibits it, may be so repulsive, that men turn away from the prospect, with confirmed aversion.

It is equally indiscreet to adopt the denouncing method. A preacher, though he ascends the pulpit for a noble purpose, dishonors his office, if instead of benevolence, he even *seems* to breathe malignancy. By denouncing men, without evincing their guilt, he apparently assumes divine prerogatives. It is different, when the decisions of the divine law are disclosed: for in this case, the speaker is unnoticed in view of a more tremendous prospect. It is Jehovah standing with his drawn sword, and refusing to sheathe it, till the sinner flies to Jesus. The voice of the herald, in this case, is on the one hand, like the roarings of Sinai, agitated by the lightnings; on the other, like the music of heaven, mingling with soft whispers from Calvary. Not so the voice of mere denunciation. From this the heart even of piety recoils; for Jesus persuaded men, and when he uttered a threatening, conscience approved the sentence. Similar to the denouncing method, is that of employing mere epithets of terror. The audience treat it as a challenge, equip themselves for combat, and the shafts of the preacher's quiver, fall harmless on their shields. Not so when the *sentiment* is terrific. No thoughts in the universe, are more terrible than such as the scriptures suggest in relation to the finally impenitent. What sinner can credit, without the most thrilling terror, at the prospect, the simple narrative of the final retribution? But mere epithets are as powerless to excite *fear*, as to excite *sublime* emotions; and to employ them for either purpose is the extreme of indiscretion.

It is no less indiscreet to introduce witticism into the pulpit. A preacher, who does this, is a living paradox. Who can think of *jesting* as the eternal world opens on his vision? Shall the minister of Christ amuse the votaries of folly, as they plunge into the vortex of the burning lake? or shall he sport with earthly baubles, in whose hands, are the treasures of eternal life?

> "So did not Paul. Direct me to a quip
> Or merry turn in all he ever wrote."

Such are a few evils of extreme indiscretion. If we compare them with those of extreme caution, the latter dwindle into comparative insignificance. To be wise as serpents and harmless as doves, is a difficult attainment; but by divine favor, it is within the province of human exertion, and glorious in its results.

For the Christian Magazine.

DANGEROUS CONSEQUENCES OF OVER-STATEMENTS.

I was lately conversing with an aged man, who had been many years a professor of religion, respecting the evidence he enjoyed of his piety. His remarks were nearly to the following purport—I know that the natural heart is opposed to all the happiness of creatures, that it delights in their misery, and had it the power, would make every one of them to suffer eternally, and to the utmost of its power. I know too, that the carnal mind is at such enmity against God, that had it an arm long enough, and strong

enough, it would sweep him from his throne, and make the created and uncreated beings around it, to constitute a universe of utmost agony. Now I know that I have enemies, and they are powerful. And I have been much employed in examining my own heart, to ascertain what I would do with them, were it consistent, that God should commit the disposal of them entirely to my hands. And I really feel that were it consistent for them to be happy, I could not find it in my heart to consign one of them to eternal misery; and were it consistent, I would even make the Prince of darkness as happy as an arch-angel. I trust therefore that I have something of the spirit of benevolence, or true holiness, in my heart.

I tried to urge upon him the importance of such a christian example, as would evince that there is something in religion above the attainment of mere human nature; such an exhibition of a heavenly spirit, in his daily intercourse with the world, as would take away, and destroy, the plea of infidelity, that there can be no reality in religion, because "there is no difference" between professors and others. But when this was urged as the necessary fruit of true benevolence, a sincere desire for the happiness of sinners, no impression could be made. This was turned off very lightly—and an effort to urge the importance of the spirit of prayer was attended with no better success.—I returned to my study sad and thoughtful. It occurred to me that the statement of total depravity, given above, makes man as bad as the devil, as bad as he can be—for who can desire any thing worse than the utmost agony of God and all his creatures? Is not this an overstatement? and is the conclusion, naturally drawn from this, that because I can find no such desire in my heart, and none even to cast one creature into eternal misery, therefore I am a christian; a safe one? Is it as good evidence of piety as the actual giving of a cup of cold water to a disciple, for Christ's sake?

ITINERATOR.

For the Christian Magazine.

EXPOSITION OF MATTHEW, III. 8.

'*Bring forth therefore fruits meet for repentance.*'

THESE words were spoken by John Baptist to the Pharisees and Sadducees. When he appeared preaching in the wilderness of Judea, multitudes came out to him and were baptized. But when he saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees come to his baptism, he said unto them, O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Bring forth therefore fruits meet for repentance.

The Pharisees and Sadducees were two distinct sects, which were in existence when the kingdom of God began to be preached by John Baptist. Although they differed materially in many respects, they were both wrong. Their principles of moral action were loose and erroneous. The Pharisees were zealous of the traditions which had come down from their fathers. They disregarded the spirit of the law, they were covetous, and when they heard the doctrines of Christ they were displeased. When, on a certain occasion, they put to him the question, "Why do thy disciples transgress the tradition of the elders? for they wash not

their hands when they eat bread," —they received the cutting reply, "Why do you also transgress the *law*, by your traditions?"

By their hypocritical conduct they sought the approbation of men and to justify themselves in their sight; but Christ says to them, "God knoweth your hearts, that which is highly esteemed among men is abomination in the sight of God." And he directed his disciples to beware of the leaven of the Pharisees which was hypocrisy.

Every thing in their conduct, feeling and sentiments, was contrary to the religion of Jesus. When they came to the baptism of John, there seems to be good reason for his exhorting them to "bring forth fruits meet for repentance." The term repentance, has different meanings in the New Testament. This arises from translating two different words in the original, which signify different states of mind, by this one word in our language. One of the original words, usually signifies a change of purpose, or mind simply, without any change of moral feeling. The other signifies a change in the moral feelings, in the heart, which is connected with reformation of life. This is the term used by John, in the passage quoted above, and implies a state of mind or heart opposed to sin. "Bring forth therefore fruits meet for repentance," (i. e.) consistent with this state of mind. The requisition made of them, then, was, that all their acts of life should be consistent with a right state of heart —that they should manifest their sincerity and love of holiness, by their obedience in conforming all their external doings to the requisition of the moral law—that they should cease their present disapproved conduct, and enter upon that course of life which flows from a penitent, humble heart, and which constitutes the *visible* of holiness. But why this exhortation?—and what the necessity of a compliance with it? A very great necessity, surely. It was the way to flee from the coming wrath. "Who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?"—If you would do this, bring forth fruits consistent with repentance.

The persons here addressed were Jews—descended from those who were beloved of God. But this would avail them nothing in his sight. Think not to say within yourselves, "we have Abraham to our father." A change of heart, and a life of piety, were the only means of escaping the wrath to come, final condemnation and ruin.

A compliance with the requisition, 'bring forth fruits consistent with a penitent state of heart,' is a most obvious and indispensable duty of every individual of our guilty race. All those tender feelings, and external accomplishments, which render a person lovely in the eyes of society, if *penitence* and *love* to God be absent, can never be the ground of acceptance with him. These external qualities alone, *do not* form the path which leads from the wrath to come. There must be a penitent heart, accompanied with that *visible* conduct, which the scriptures describe as flowing from it. E. S.

No man is past all hopes of salvation until he is past all *possibility* of Repentance, until he is *absolutely* hardened against all gospel corrections.—*Owen*.

For the Christian Magazine.

MEANS ESSENTIAL TO THE PERSEVERANCE AND SALVATION OF SAINTS.

[Concluded from page 24.]

My first remark, upon the subject discussed in a former number, is, That saints cannot be saved, unless they *continue* in the faith of Jesus. What God determines to do in one way, he equally determines not to do in another. His determination to keep saints by his power *through faith* unto salvation, implies a determination not to preserve them *without* faith. All therefore which is implied in the exercise of true faith, and all which necessarily results from this, is as essential to the salvation of believers, as it would have been, had not their salvation been made certain; for the promise of God that they shall be saved, is not a promise that they shall be saved *without* faith, but "through faith." We have seen that faith implies divine knowledge; and that watchfulness, prayer, and christian exertion, are its necessary consequences. Saints, therefore, in order to be saved, must seek after Divine knowledge, be watchful against indulgence in sin, be sincere, importunate, and persevering in their prayers, and active and faithful in the service of God. If any one is disposed to infer from the fact, that God has made the salvation of saints certain, that it is not necessary to their salvation, that they should search the scriptures, and watch, and pray, and exert themselves in the service of God, he is regardless of the *manner*, in which God has made their salvation certain. He has forgotten that God, in his purpose, has connected the salvation of saints with the performance of these duties, and made their salvation certain, only by making it certain, that they will perform these duties. Paul, who, as we have seen, often dwelt with great delight upon the certainty of the saints' salvation, appears to have considered their own exertions as absolutely essential to the obtaining of it. He speaks of the watchfulness, fidelity and perseverance of Timothy, as something which was essential to his own and others' salvation. "Take heed, he says, unto thyself, and unto thy doctrine: *continue* in them, for in so doing thou shalt both *save* thyself and them that hear thee." In his Epistle to the Corinthians, Paul speaks of their exertions as essential to *their* salvation, and of his own as essential to his. "Know ye not, that they which run in a race, run all, but one receiveth the prize? So *run*, that ye *may obtain*. And every man that striveth for the mastery is temperate in all things. Now they do it to obtain a *corruptible* crown; but we an *incorruptible*. I, therefore, so run, not as uncertainly; so fight I, not as one that beateth the air: but I keep under my body and bring it into subjection: lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a cast away." How essential to the salvation of believers, are their constant and persevering exertions, may be still more clearly seen by a moment's attention to a passage in Paul's epistle to the Hebrews. "But exhort one another daily, while it is called to-day, lest any of you be hardened through the deceitfulness of sin. For we are made partakers of Christ, if we hold the beginning of our confidence stedfast unto the end." Christ, who once said, "He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come

into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life," on another occasion plainly intimated to his disciples, that they could not be saved unless they continued united to him by faith. "I am the vine, ye are the branches; he that abideth in me and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit; for without me ye can do nothing. If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch and is withered; and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned."

These quotations show unequivocally that God, so far from having determined to save believers without their continued union to Christ, and cheerful engagedness in his service, has determined not to do it in this way. The way, in which God is disposed to save believers, is that which is expressed in the following and similar passages of scripture. "Who are kept by the power of God *through faith* unto salvation." Every promise of his, which secures their salvation, secures it on the ground of their cordial union to Christ, and habitual, and persevering exertion in his service. The hope, therefore, which professors of religion sometimes indulge of the security of their salvation, while they are in heart alienated from Christ, and habitually indulging themselves in spiritual sloth and idleness, and unfeelingly transgressing his most plain and important commands, is nothing better than mere presumption. Although we do believe, that none of Christ's sheep will ever be lost; yet we know that he is not disposed to save them in *this* way. There is not a promise, or an intimation in scripture, that a single individual of the human race will ever be saved in this way, but much to the contrary. Every person who feels himself disposed to make the promise of God, that all true believers shall be saved, the occasion of his living in sin, whatever may be his hopes or pretensions, has reason to consider himself as yet an unbeliever, and as in a course, in which he is actually "treasuring up wrath against the day of wrath, and the revelation of the righteous judgment of God."

2. If God, in preserving believers unto salvation, makes use of means, then it is not strange that the scriptures often address them in the language of caution, admonition, and threatening, as well as of promise. It has been supposed by some, that if God has promised to save all true believers, there can be no propriety in cautioning them against apostacy, or in threatening them with punishment, should they fall away. This supposition would be well founded, had he promised to save them without means. But this is not the fact. He has engaged to save no believer without his own exertions to keep himself in the path of life. Now if God is disposed to save believers, by means of their own exertions, is it not proper and necessary that they should be *influenced to exertion?* And if it is necessary that they should be influenced to exertion, is it not proper that means should be used for this purpose? But I would ask, what are the proper means of influencing rational creatures? Are they not motives addressed to the understanding? To this every one will assent. Well then, what motives can be supposed better calculated to influence the mind of a believer, than those which are presented before him in the cautions, admonitions, threatenings and promises of the gospel?

But it will be said, that no believer who has been made sure of his salvation by the promises of God, can be *afraid* of being lost. Consequently it must be useless, either to caution him against apostacy, or to threaten him with punishment should he fall away.

This objection, although at first view exceedingly plausible, admits of an easy and a satisfactory answer. For in the *first* place, Christians who are cautioned and threatened against apostacy in the scriptures, are not generally certain that they shall be saved. They know, indeed, that all true believers "will be kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation." But they are not certain that *they are true believers.* Very few, compared with the whole number of saints, to whom the cautions and threatenings against apostacy have been addressed, have *ever* enjoyed a full assurance that they were true believers, and *none* of them have enjoyed this assurance uniformly, through the whole course of their lives. Consequently the support to the objections arising from their *certainty* of salvation entirely fails.

Besides, it is here to be considered that the scriptures, in which these cautions and threatenings are found, speak of and to mankind agreeably to their professions. Christ addressed his followers, as his friends, according to their profession, although he knew that there was a Judas among them. Paul, and the rest of the Apostles, addressed the churches, to whom they wrote, as true believers according to their profession, although it cannot be supposed that they thought that every individual of them was a real christian. Considering then, that those whom Christ and his Apostles addressed as believers, were some of them true saints, and some of them false professors, and all of them at times uncertain of their interest in Christ, we can easily see ground for all the cautions, admonitions, and threatenings, which ever dropt from their lips or pens. The disciples of Christ, all of them, had at times, reason to fear that they should actually incur the guilt and condemnation of apostacy. When Christ told them that one of them should betray him, they *were* all afraid, and said one by one, "Lord, is it I?" Those, to whom the Apostles directed their Epistles, were doubtless often anxious, lest they should prove themselves hypocrites. They felt the force of the cautions and admonitions which they received; and these no doubt in many instances proved, as it was designed they should do, the means of preserving true believers from falling, and of influencing them to grow in grace and in the knowledge of their Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

But in the second place, there is room for the cautions, admonitions and threatenings against apostacy to have influence with those, who have an assurance that they are true believers, and consequently of their salvation. Not, indeed, by exciting their fears; for it must be allowed that they cannot be afraid of being lost, while they know that they shall be saved. But if it is true that christians, although it is certain they will be saved, cannot be saved in a course of sin, may it not be supposed to have some effect upon their minds to let them know this? If they are desirous of being saved, and a life of holiness is the only means by which their salvation can be effected, may it not be expected, that as

rational creatures, they will be more likely to pursue the path of holiness, if they know this fact, than they would, if they were ignorant of it? This fact, the cautions and admonitions which are found in scripture against apostacy, clearly intimate to them. And these, by thus presenting before saints a strong motive to holiness, are doubtless often the means of keeping them in the path of life. As God has not merely purposed to save believers, but to save them by means of their own exertions, there is a perfect propriety in placing before them motives to action. And if there is any thing which can operate upon their minds as a motive to virtuous action, it is rational to suppose, that this must be the truth, and the whole truth. Now if it be a truth, that God has rendered their salvation sure, by making their perseverance in holiness so, are we not to expect that a knowledge of this fact as it is, will prove the most efficacious and salutary motive that can be placed before them?

That rational creatures can be influenced to make exertions for their safety, when their safety is made sure by the promise of God, is rendered undeniable by what actually took place on board the ship, in which Paul and his companions were wrecked. The history of this disaster is doubtless familiar to most of my readers. It was, as you will all recollect, by means of Paul's caution, that the seamen were prevented fleeing out of the ship at a time when their presence and exertion were indispensable to the safety of the crew. Although an angel of God had previously told Paul that there should be no loss of any man's life among them; yet when he saw the seamen about to flee out of the ship, he said to the centurion and the soldiers, except these abide in the ship, ye cannot be saved. Paul knew, that although God had determined to bring them all safe to land, he had not determined to do it without means. It was proper, therefore, for him, when he saw the sailors about to leave the ship, and thus to relinquish all means of saving her, to tell them that if they did this, they could not be saved. This timely caution, as appears from the history of the event, was the means of retaining the sailors in the ship, and of their all arriving safe to land, agreeably to the purpose of God made known to Paul.

The conduct of Paul in this affair strikingly illustrates the propriety of cautioning saints against apostacy. There is as much need of believers continuing in obedience to the Divine commands, in order for them to arrive safely to heaven, as there was of the sailors' remaining in the ship, in order to her crew's arriving safely to land. The obedience of believers is as really connected with their salvation, in the purpose of God, as the continuance of the sailors in the ship was with the ultimate preservation of her crew. The cautions which are given to saints in the scriptures against their apostacy, are as really efficacious in preventing it, as the caution of Paul was in preventing the sailors deserting the ship. And as the conduct of Paul in threatening the centurion and the soldiers with the loss of their lives, if they suffered the ship to be deserted by her seamen, was consistent with the purpose of God before revealed to save them all; so are the threatenings of future punishment to saints, should they apostatize, consistent with his purpose "to

keep them by his power through faith unto salvation."

I conclude this discussion, with one remark upon the false and unfair representations which are often made of the doctrine of the saints' perseverance. It is often said that this encourages saints in sloth and sin. Its advocates are represented as holding, that a holy life is not necessary to salvation, and that any one who has been renewed in the spirit of his mind, will be saved, even although he may afterwards continue to indulge himself in every species of wickedness. Now, with the preceding discussion of the subject before them, my readers cannot fail to perceive the falsehood, and unfairness of these and all similar representations. In these, the principle most essential to a thorough understanding of the subject, is entirely overlooked, or kept concealed, viz. that the purpose of God renders the salvation of all true believers certain, only by rendering their perseverance in *holiness* certain. Let this principle be understood and considered, and there can appear nothing in the doctrine suited to encourage sloth or sin. The first and the last impression, which it is calculated to make upon every fair mind, is, that a life of sin is inconsistent with salvation, and a life of holiness, that without which it cannot be secured. A.

For the Christian Magazine.

ANSWER TO INQUIRIES RESPECTING SUBMISSION.

Messrs. Editors,—I find, in your Magazine for January, several inquiries upon the subject of submission, proposed by Juvenis to Senex, the author of a communication upon this subject, extracted from the Utica Repository. It would give me much pleasure to see an answer to these inquiries from the pen of Senex. But doubting whether he would consider himself under obligation to vindicate his communication in a work in which it was probably inserted without his knowledge, and feeling myself in somewhat a scribbling mood, I am disposed, although a young man, to "shew mine opinion."

After observing that "the proper place for a young man is sitting at the feet of the old, asking *questions*, and receiving instruction," and expressing "a hope that your venerable correspondent *Senex*, will suffer him to take his place at his feet, and propose a few humble inquiries," he thus introduces his subject.

"If I rightly understand the views of *Senex*, he has undertaken to answer the question, "*when* ought a regenerate person, or real christian, to be willing that God should destroy him in a future state?" And the answer is briefly this, "when such a person does not *know* that he is renewed." And this knowing, seems not to mean positive certainty; but to be limited and explained by another expression, "he sees no evidence of being a subject of saving grace—that is, he has "no hope." Upon this ignorance of his good estate, on which Juvenis considers Senex as resting the propriety of a christian's being willing to be destroyed, he makes a number of inquiries.

1. "Does God *require* this ignorance?—And if he has not *required* this ignorance which is essential to unconditional submission, then, can it be believed that he has *required* the consequent submission?"

To this I answer, it makes no difference whether this ignorance is required, or not. Its existence, whatever may be its cause, may be a proper occasion for the exercise of submission. It is certainly a clear case, that every one ought to submit to what he *supposes* to be the purpose of God, whether he is rightly informed or not. Juvenis seems to think, that because this ignorance is not a duty, nothing which is a consequence of this, can be a duty. But here he is greatly mistaken. He might as well say, that repentance, is not required, because sin, of which it is a consequence, and which is the only thing that renders it necessary, is not required. But he would smile at the logic of a man who should reason thus in regard to repentance. It may be well for Juvenis here to pause and consider, that submission to a just punishment, is *always* the consequence of what God has not required, but forbidden.

2. "Has God made this ignorance *necessary*?—And if this ignorance is not, on the plan of God's dealings with new creatures, made necessary to salvation, then can it be believed that the submission which follows it, is necessary to salvation? And if not, then are not those ministers who preach that this submission is essential to salvation, laying a yoke on their people which God has not laid on them?"

Whether this ignorance be *necessary* or not, is of no more consequence, as it respects the duty of unconditional submission, than the question whether it is *required* or not. If the penalty of the divine law is just, and an individual sincerely believes, as many a christian has done, that the glory of God, and the good of his kingdom, require that this should be executed upon him; he certainly must submit to it, or oppose the supposed purpose of God. The fact that this mistake or ignorance is not necessary, does not prove that the consequent submission is not necessary, any more than the fact, that a sinner's wickedness is not necessary, proves that the consequent duty of repentance is not necessary to salvation. It is believed, that Juvenis himself will not deny, that a disposition to submit to the known, or supposed purposes of God, is a duty essential to salvation. To his question, whether "those ministers, who preach that this submission is essential to salvation, are not laying a yoke upon their people which God has not laid upon them?" I reply, If unconditional submission is a duty which doubting christians may and ought to perform, and which is the most sure and ready way of obtaining light and comfort, then are not those ministers deficient in duty, or unskilful in their work, who cavil at, and deny this, rather than faithfully inculcate it?

3. "Is it a *fact*, that *every one* who is born of God, is left for a time without any evidence that he is a subject of saving grace?—And if there are any who are renewed creatures, and have never been the subjects of this ignorance, then, are there not some who *ought not* to have felt this submission which is founded on such ignorance?"

It is possible, that there are some who have never felt themselves destitute of evidence that they are subjects of grace, since they were renewed. But if this is the fact, it proves nothing against the reality and importance of unconditional submission, in all those cases in which christians are in doubt; and it will not be

denied, that there are few, comparatively, who are not at times in this condition. Besides, it was not the intention of Senex, to intimate, that none but doubting *christians* were under obligation to exercise unconditional submission. He appears to have undertaken to show "*when* a regenerate person, or real christian, ought to be willing that God should destroy him in a future state," with a view only to meet the argument of Mr. S. who had said, "If we suppose a person submissively resigned to future misery, we suppose him, of course, to be a real christian.—We have, then, this incongruity presented. Here is a christian resigned to future evil, which can by no possibility take place under the government of God. For God cannot, without a sacrifice of his veracity, permit a real christian to perish." To meet this argument, it was to the purpose of Senex to show, as he has done, that there are real christians, who, ignorant of their good estate, sincerely believe that it is God's purpose to destroy them, and that with these impressions, they ought to be willing that his purpose should be executed. But this reasoning, so far from restricting the duty of unconditional submission to doubting *christians*, evidently supposes that it is binding on all impenitent sinners, as every one of this description has reason to fear that it is the purpose of God to destroy him. Every one, who has become a christian, has seen the time, when he was altogether uncertain, whether the purpose and the glory of God did not require his everlasting destruction. As this was an evil, to which he could not but feel that he was justly exposed, it was an evil to which he ought to have been resigned. Can a person, I ask, be reconciled to God, without being reconciled to his *law?* And can a person be reconciled to the law of God, without cordially approving of its *penalty*, as well as precept? And can a person cordially approve of the penalty of the law, without being willing to *suffer* it, provided, in his view, the glory of God requires its execution upon him?

4. "Does not the submission of the new-creature, however much in the dark respecting the nature of his exercises, absolutely forbid his being willing to remain impenitent another moment?"

I believe, with Senex, "that present submission is inconsistent with present disobedience." And I admit with Juvenis, that "impenitence is disobedience." But I do not believe, that present submission is inconsistent with a willingness that the purpose of God, respecting our future impenitence, or disobedience, should be carried into execution. The whole difficulty on this subject, appears to me to arise from not considering that sin is to be viewed in two distinct attitudes. It must be viewed as the *voluntary, criminal act of the sinner*, and also as *the effect of a divine purpose.* Now, although, when we confine our views to sin, as *sin*, or as the voluntary, criminal act of the sinner, it is an object of aversion and regret; yet, when viewed, also, as it must be by every intelligent mind, as an effect of a divine purpose, it becomes an object of submission, as an event which God has appointed to be overruled for good. It is true, that no person can *confine* his views to sin, *as sin merely*, and feel resigned to it. Viewed in this attitude, it must be an object of hatred, regret, and decided opposition. But the scriptures require us to look at sin,

not only as the voluntary, criminal act of the sinner, but as the effect of a divine purpose. And when a good man looks at it in this light, although he will still hate it as the criminal act of the sinner, or for what it is in itself, he will view it as an object of submission, because God has appointed it. No good man can contemplate his own future impenitence, as his voluntary criminal act *merely*, with submission. There is nothing in this view of the subject that requires submission. But the moment he looks at it as the effect of a divine purpose, much as he detests it as his own criminal act, he will submit to it. It is on this ground, that christians do submit to live in a state of imperfection in this world. They fervently *desire* to be perfectly holy; when they think of disobeying any of the divine commands in future, the thought is inexpressibly painful, and did they not know, that it is the purpose of God that no man shall be perfect here, they could not submit to such an evil in prospect. But when they consider, that God has, for wise and benevolent purposes, determined that they shall be but partially sanctified in this world, they submit to future imperfections, on the same principle that they submit to any other evil which he has appointed.

5. "Every one knows that it is God's purpose that the impenitent only shall be destroyed in a future state—therefore, does not unconditional willingness to be destroyed in a future state, implying of necessity, a willingness to remain impenitent, destroy itself?"

No one supposes, that any person ought to be *unconditionally* willing to be destroyed in a future state. It is only upon the supposition, that a person believes the glory of God requires his destruction, that it is thought to be his duty to submit to this. And this does not, as the question above stated supposes, *necessarily* imply a willingness to remain impenitent. Future impenitence, is no part of the penalty of the law. A person may be willing, and it is believed that many have been willing, "to accept the punishment of their iniquity," without once *considering* that it is the purpose of God that all who are cast off, shall remain in impenitence. But allowing, as we must, that they do sometimes consider that all who are cast off, will remain impenitent, the difficulty presented is precisely the same in kind, with that which attends a willingness to remain imperfect in this life. They can submit to this, as the effect of a divine *purpose*, in the same manner, in which they submit to any other evil, which in itself they hate. Their submission to this, as the effect of a divine purpose, implies no approbation of it as *sin*, nor a disposition to disobey any divine precept; but is perfectly consistent with the most fervent desire to be holy, and with present efforts to continue so. If future impenitence could be viewed in no other light than as the mere criminal act of the sinner, that is, if the purpose of God could not be seen in it, it is readily granted, that it could not be an object of submission, and that a willingness to be impenitent, in this sense, would be impenitence itself. But to submit to it as the effect of a divine purpose, is the same thing as to be willing, in any other case, that the counsel of God should stand.

"I have heard old men say, that all the purposes of God re-

specting the existence of moral evil, or whenever they render any moral evil certain, are, and must be, in opposition to his precepts.—If so, then, which shall we make the rule of our duty—that is, of all our affections and exercises—God's precepts or his purposes? Is it not clear that both cannot be? And if the precept is the rule, then would not the most heartfelt opposition, on the part of Lucifer, in the case supposed (by Senex) against disobedience, the very thing which God had decreed, constitute the very highest act of obedience to the rule—the precept, and render him the most lovely and holy in the sight of God?"

There are old men, who would tell Juvenis, if he would consult them, that God's purposes, when known, are as truly objects of submission, as his precepts are a rule of obedience. And for my own part, I can see no inconsistency between his precepts as a rule of duty, and his purposes as objects of submission. Whatever other disagreement there may be between God's precepts and his purposes, there is certainly this agreement between them: His precepts require us to submit to his purposes. Juvenis will not deny, that we are required "to submit ourselves to God." But we cannot submit ourselves to him, without submitting to whatever we consider as his purpose.

But it is not necessary, in the case supposed by Senex, nor in any other supposed by the advocates of unconditional submission, to disobey any of God's precepts in order to submit to his purposes. The submission, of which they speak, is to future, not to present impenitence. "It is granted," says Senex, "that present submission is inconsistent with present disobedience. No person in the actual exercise of submission to God, can, by that actual submission, disobey God." If Lucifer, the day before he disobeyed, had been told it was the purpose of God, that to-morrow he should disobey, and he had submitted, he would not, by this submission, have disobeyed any divine precept or opposed any divine purpose. At the time of his submission, he would have regarded with a proper spirit, both the precept and purpose of God. But if he "had manifested the most heartfelt opposition" to this, as the purpose of God, he would have done both. He might, indeed, have exercised "the most heartfelt opposition" to his future disobedience, considered merely as *sin*, but while he felt this opposition to it, in itself considered, he must have submitted to it as the effect of God's purpose. So in every case in which an individual truly "accepts the punishment of his iniquity," and *considers*, at the time, that this will be connected with future impenitence. He submits to this impenitence in prospect, as the effect of God's purpose; while he hates it as *sin*, with perfect hatred, and fervently desires, in itself considered, to be perfectly holy, as well as happy.

It is not, I apprehend, sufficiently considered, that submission always implies an *evil*, real or supposed, to be submitted to. Many seem to speak of the subject, as though we must cordially approve of that to which we submit. But the truth is, that to which we submit, is always in itself to us a real or supposed *evil*. We submit to it, not because of any approbation we feel of the thing itself; but merely because we love God who appoint-

ed it, and desire the promotion of his glory. This thought pursued, will throw much light upon the subject now under discussion.

I regret to say, that Juvenis, by the form and manner in which he has proposed his questions, has raised a great dust, and thrown an otherwise plain subject into needless obscurity. It is a very plain case, that all men deserve to suffer the penalty of God's law; and an equally plain case, that each of them, before he becomes truly reconciled to him, has reason to fear that it is God's purpose that *he* suffer it. This makes it plainly the duty of each to submit to it. It is not seen how it is possible, for any person to become truly reconciled to God, without doing this.

It is an indisputable fact, that all true christians are reconciled to the known purpose of God, in the destruction of some of their *fellow creatures.* And upon the supposition, that they love their neighbour as themselves, there is no more difficulty in their being willing to suffer the penalty of the law themselves, provided they suppose that the glory of God requires it, than there is in submitting to the destruction of others.

It is a very plain case, that all real christians are obliged to submit, not only to the present, but future *impenitence* of their fellow-creatures. Nor is there really any more difficulty in submitting to their own future impenitence, than there is in submitting to the future impenitence of others. They cannot submit to the present or future impenitence of their fellow-creatures, viewed merely as *sin*, or, *as it is in itself*, disconnected with the purpose of God. The only way in which they can be reconciled to this, is to view it as the effect of a divine purpose. The consciences of plain christians bear them witness, that in this view of the subject, they do submit to all the evil which is now in the universe, and to all which they know will exist forever. But it is just as easy to submit to our own future impenitence, viewed as the effect of a divine purpose, as it is to submit to the impenitence of others. I insist upon it, Messrs. Editors, that unconditional submission, as advocated by Senex, is a plain, practical subject, attended with no more difficulty, than many others involved in the creed of every man, who believes in the eternal and universal purpose of God.

ALIUS JUVENIS.

From the New-York Observer.

THE JUDGE AND THE UNIVERSALIST.

IN one of the Middle States, a Universalist preacher, some time since, made great efforts to establish a Society of his own faith. A few persons, of little character and influence, were deeply anxious that such a Society should be formed among them, but knew not how to effect their object and build a house. It was finally agreed that the preacher and one of his followers should wait on a distinguished Judge who resided in the village, and solicit his patronage. The Judge heard the loquacious preacher with great patience for almost half an hour, when he closed by asking the Judge's aid in establishing the Society.

"No," says the Judge: "I shall not be disposed, sir, to lend you any assistance, in forming *such* a Society. For in the first place, it seems to me that your system of faith is not supported by the

Holy Scriptures. I confess I am not so thoroughly versed in those writings as I ought to be; yet I should hardly know how to express the eternity of future punishment more clearly than I often see it there described. But this, sir, I do believe, (let the Scriptures say what they may,) that were all clergymen to preach this doctrine which you preach, there would soon be a *hell in this world*, if not in the next." The Judge then added with seriousness, that if all who profess to preach the Gospel were to adopt and inculcate such sentiments, he did not believe it would be possible to hold civil society together. Human laws would be trampled under foot, and their penalties, if not backed by Divine threatenings, would be but a subject of mockery. With these views he must be excused from making any efforts to establish a Universalist Society in that place or any other.

The correctness of the above cited occurrence may be relied on: and as to the justness of the Judge's views—reason, common sense, and the Scriptures say, Amen. B.

Religious Intelligence.

REVIVALS.

We hear of revivals of religion in Ludlow, Mass.; in a factory village called Burrillville; in Ellington and Vernon, Con. in Warsaw, Vernon centre, N. Y. and in Middle-Haddam, Con. In this place nearly 70 are said to be hopeful subjects of renewing grace. A powerful work of divine grace is said to be going on in Barre, Vt. Number of hopeful converts supposed to be not far from 200. One Universalist preacher is said to be among the number.

From a letter recently published in the N. Y. Observer, it appears that a work of grace has commenced among the members of the Legislature of Georgia. "At an anxious meeting fifteen of them were inquirers, and five or six indulged a hope, that they had found the Messiah. In the same communication, it was stated that there was a revival in Athens College, Geo. and 30 students subjects of the work. Also that an interesting revival had commenced in Washington, of that state.

The Lord is reviving his work in Fort Covington, Messina, Lewisville, Madrid, Potsdam, Parishville, Hopkinton, Stockholm, Warsaw and Wayne, N. Y.

Seventy-three persons were received into the Church in East Hartford, on the first Sabbath of the present year.—*Con. Obs.*

From the Missionary Herald.

MISSIONARY ESTABLISHMENTS.

The union between the United Foreign Missionary Society and the American Board, was consummated in the early part of last summer. The missions, which came under the direction of the Board, in consequence of that event, are among the Osage Indians; among the Indians in New-York, at Mackinaw, and at Maumee; and among the American emigrants on the island of Hayti.

The United Foreign Missionary Society held its ninth anniversary in May last. The mission to the Osage Indians was proposed about seven years ago, and, in the spring of 1820, the first missionaries to that tribe left the city of New-York on their benevolent enterprize. The mission to the Indians of New-York, was commenced by the New-York Missionary Society, many years ago, and was transferred in 1820. That at Maumee, in Ohio, was established by the Synod of Pittsburgh, and transferred in the autumn of 1825.

The missions now established, are at Bombay—in Ceylon—among the Cherokees—the Choctaws—the Cherokees-of-the-Arkansas—the Osages—the Indians in New-York—at Mackinaw—at Maumee—the American Emi-

grants in Hayti—at the Sandwich Islands—in Malta—Syria—and Palestine.

SUMMARY.

Number of Stations occupied,	43
Preachers from this country,	33
Male Missionaries and Assistants, 89	
Female Assistants, including the wives of the Missionaries, 92—181	
Native Preachers,	2
Other Native Assistants,	18
Churches, organized at the stations,	25
Native members of these Churches, upwards of	200
Schools,	about 200
Scholars,	about 20,000

RETROSPECT OF THE YEAR.

THE following review of the principal intelligence received, during the past year, from the missions under the direction of the Board, was prepared for the United Monthly Concert, held in Park-street Church, Boston, on the first Monday evening of December. At the request of several respected friends, it is inserted in the Missionary Herald, with some enlargement of matter, and a slight alteration of form.

The intelligence from BOMBAY, has never been so pleasing, and never so painful, as during the past year.

The letter published in April, was a most decisive document to prove, that the mission had struck its roots deep in the native soil, and wanted only more of the warmth of Christian patronage, soon to extend its brauches wide. It contained a summary and very animating view of the advances made during the ten years past. The amount was, that preparatory work had been accomplished sufficient to enable a missionary, entering the field *now*, to exert ten times as much influence on the native population, as he could have done *ten years ago*; so that the same number of laborers might advance ten times as rapidly towards a glorious success, as they could have done only as many years since. Numerous channels of influence had been opened, and the waters of salvation had been made to flow in them. The attention of the natives had been gained, to a considerable extent;—that point, so difficult of acquisition, and yet so all important to any great and valuable results: and so much Christian knowledge had been thrown into the native mind, that impressions on the heart began to be visible, and fair was the prospect of an effusion of the Holy Spirit. Indeed, one person, as the first fruits of the harvest, had been admitted to the fellowship of the visible church.

But by the time the harvest was about to wave, lo, in the mysterious providence of God, the reapers had nearly all been removed!

It was just when this mission began to assume its brightest aspect, and when we were beginning to rejoice in that brightness, that a portentous cloud spread suddenly over the horizon. While the executive officers of the Board were assembled, with their brethren, in the house of prayer, at the Monthly Concert in September, they received the letters, which announced the death of Hall; and it was then and there, that the mournful tidings commenced its afflictive march through the land.

Hall died not, however, till he had seen at least a hundred thousand Christian books distributed among the Mahratta people; nor till he had witnessed the New Testament translated, faithfully, from the original Greek into the vernacular tongue of 12,000,000 of people, perishing for lack of knowledge. Nor did he cease from his labors, till his powerful mind, with its customary facilities of thought and force of expression, had composed an appeal to the churches, which spreading abroad with the tidings of his decease, sent thrilling emotions through the land, and occasioned a multitude of prayers, that God would send forth laborers into the harvest.

And oh! who will not unite in this prayer? One more stroke, such as has thrice been felt in Bombay, in the short space of sixteen months, would silence, utterly, the voice of Christian preaching among the numerous population of that city. The general curiosity, which, for twelve years, has been waking up, would again become the apathy of death. The schools would decline, and the scholars forget their knowledge, lose their impressions, and glide away in the current of superstition, until, borne beyond the possibility of recovery, they would sink to rise no more. The books, which have been translated, printed, and circulated, with so much labor, and pains, and cost of health and talent and life, for want of the living voice to call attention to them, and impress a sense of their value, would be neglected and lost and destroyed. Congregations would cease to convene

for religious worship; and the native, wondering what had become of the holy influence, that met him in the streets, and bazars, and temples, and fields, and every where, would pursue his idolatry as aforetime, before the light of heaven broke in upon his darkness. Already, may we suppose, has the current begun to set backwards, and every month, and every day, it gains strength!"*

The fact of principal interest, in regard to the CEYLON mission, which has been communicated the past year, is, that the mission church now contains not less than *ninety native members*;—many possessing fine minds; several considerably advanced in learning; some useful preachers of the Gospel to their countrymen; and all hopefully pious, and, amid temptations such as we by experience know nothing of, adorning their profession by a Christian life.—We have been informed, also, that the prospect, at first dark and forbidding, has become hopeful, of raising the females of Ceylon from their deep degradation to their proper standing in society.—Happy, moreover, have we been to hear, that minds, which, only a few years since, valued caste at so high a rate, and knowledge at so low, that money would hardly induce them to forego the one for the sake of the other, now cheerfully disregard caste, and earnestly petition for the pleasures of enlightened thought.

From PALESTINE, during the early part of the year, we heard little but weeping, because Fisk, that ornament to the missionary character, had ceased to be seen on earth. *Here*, too, we could not but weep, when the beautifully simple letter of his surviving brethren, describing his last sorrows and pains, was received; and we heard the voice of lamentation, as that letter travelled through the churches. We trusted in God, however, who permitted Stephen, and even some of the apostles, to be cut off early in their ministry, in that very land, that the mission would not only survive, but prosper. Yet we dared not to anticipate such early and such strong impressions upon the corrupt and ignorant priesthood of Syria, as those concerning which we are now permitted to speak. It now appears, that a spirit of inquiry is waking up again in the ancient birth-place of Christianity, and is beginning to run with so strong a tide, that it is not likely, if these western churches do their duty, that the powers of earth and hell combined, will be able to stop it.

The intelligence from the mission among the CHEROKEES, has been, on the whole, of a more decisive and cheering character, than in any former years—if we except, perhaps, the one immediately preceding. We have had more proof, that Indians, properly situated, can be civilized, than has ever before been exhibited, since this country was settled by our fathers. Agriculture having made considerable advances, and government having assumed a definite form, under the influence of Christian principles, the general mind of the Cherokees has felt the same cravings for knowledge, that we do ourselves: and, during the past year, we have heard of their spirited efforts to procure, for their own use, a printing establishment, and to lay the foundations of a national academy.

Passing over the other missions among the Indians, for want of room to notice them properly, we come to the SANDWICH ISLANDS, which have occupied much of our attention, during the period now under review.

We felt, in the years previous to the one just closed, that the intelligence from this mission was by no means without high interest. Nor were we in an error. The dealings of Providence towards that mission, have been wonderful from the first. But the intelligence of the past year has transcended all that the most sanguine, even when warmed with former accounts, dared to expect.

Within this space of time, we have been told of nine chiefs, embodying a great portion of the civil influence of the islands, publicly professing their faith in Christ, and heartily entering upon the discharge of their duties towards God and their fellow-men. We have been told of half a score of churches, and more, erected by the

* It may be remarked here, that the sole reason, hitherto, why the mission at Bombay has not been more strongly reinforced, has been the want of suitable persons, who have been willing to be sent thither. Even now, notwithstanding the urgency of the case, the difficulties of this kind seem hard to be removed. And they are increased by a want of adequate funds. Oh, where is the spirit of apostolic enterprise!

natives themselves, for the worship of Jehovah, and crowded with attentive hearers. We have been told, by one who witnessed the sight, of more than 2,000 islanders, moving along in one interesting procession, bearing on their shoulders, from distant mountains, the materials for one of these churches, which, when completed, could contain 4,000 people, and was thronged to overflowing. We have been told of near 20,000 people under instruction, taught by competent natives, whom the missionaries had qualified for the service—of more than 12,000, able to read the word of God, were that blessed volume ready to be put into their hands—and of a most longing desire, every where expressed, to come into speedy possession of that richest treasure. We have been told of the effusions of the Holy Spirit at Honoruru. at Lahaina, and in different parts of Hawaii; and that, as the results of these heavenly visitations, more than 2,000 islanders, lately shrouded in the deep glooms of a barbarous paganism, have erected the family altar, for the morning and evening worship of the true God. We have been told of regular meetings for prayer among the females and among the males of those islands, just as there are among ourselves when religion flourishes; and of the high satisfaction, with which the once haughty and cruel chiefs mingle with those, whom they once despised and oppressed, in the solemn acts of devotion.

We have heard of changes in the characters of *individuals*, which, though great and surprising, cannot now be fully described. We remember the intemperate Karaimoku, regent of the islands, transformed into a sober, humble follower of Jesus—the conceited, haughty, jealous, cruel queen Kaahamanu, whose forbearance and lenity the affrighted natives, wherever she went, used to propitiate by peace offerings, as if she were a demon; now as actively benevolent, as she was once actively cruel; and as devoted to God, as she was once to Satan—and Kapiolani, also a chief woman, once intemperate, and the slave of every moral debasement that a vicious barbarism has attained to; now, reformed, intelligent, pious, actively benevolent, and with manners so improved, that civilized society would not blush to own her for its own.

Nor have we heard, the past year, of changes less wonderful, in the manners and habits of *villages*, than of individuals. At Lahaina, not long since, scarcely any thing could be kept from the rapacity of thieves, who were as numerous as the inhabitants themselves. Locks, guards, the utmost vigilance, every precaution, were ineffectual. But, as we have been told the past year, so great has been the moral change in that place, that, for successive months, although every thing was exposed, and nothing was guarded, and hundreds of natives were entering the missionary's habitation every day; nothing, absolutely nothing, was lost. At Kaavaroa, on Hawaii, a little more than two years ago, the people were opposed to Christianity, given to inebriation, quarrelsome, often engaged in domestic broils, and grovelling in the lowest ignorance and debasement. But within a few months we have been informed, on authority not to be questioned, that intoxication is no longer witnessed in that place; that there are no more family quarrels; that family prayers are uniformly attended; that kind offices are every where rendered; and that, from remote villages, individuals come to inquire respecting the new way, and with tears beseech that some one may be sent to instruct them. And so far had the people of this village advanced, that we were not surprised to hear of their forming a society to support their missionary, and that, from their "deep poverty," they had contributed for this purpose a greater value, than is ordinarily contributed for missions in our own towns.

Without dwelling longer on the intelligence communicated respecting this mission, we pass to a department of missionary effort, which has scarcely been alluded to in this retrospective view, and yet has not been overlooked in the statements of the year. We refer to the PRINTING ESTABLISHMENTS. Saying nothing of former years, we have heard, within a little more than the space of time now under review, of *three millions and a half* of pages, made living and efficacious by the religious truth impressed upon them at Malta, and Bombay, and the Sandwich Islands:—which is nearly half as many as have been printed in all the preceding years. We have heard, too, of the travels of these little eloquent messengers of truth—through the Sand-

wich Islands—over the populous Mahratta country—into Greece, and Asia Minor, and Syria, and Palestine—and into countries farther towards the rising sun: all calculated to produce the very best kind of intelligence known on earth, and adapted to act powerfully on the mind, elevating, enlarging, and strengthening it, and fitting it to live and move and act to some purpose on the stage of human life, and in the boundless spheres of eternity.—Oh who can tell how many fatal errors have been removed; and how many new, all-important, glorious views have been imparted!

Do not the events of the past year declare, with an impressive voice, that this cause is of God? And call they not loudly upon all to be co-workers with God, by contributing their aid to its advancement?

See we not, too, that money and labor, bestowed upon American missions to the heathen, have not been expended in vain? and that not in vain has prayer gone up to heaven?

And may we not perceive, that the cause is advancing with accelerated rapidity? The last year's intelligence was more interesting, than that of any previous year, and the last three years embrace more proofs of successful operation, than did the twelve that preceded. What if the progress for three, or six, or twelve years to come, should be like that of the three years past? Say you, it is more than we have reason to expect? So, twelve months ago, would what has since saluted our ears have appeared to us; and if the good and animating intelligence, the past year, has exceeded what we had reason to anticipate, so may it be in time to come.

At any rate, the cause is of God. And though clouds may rise, and storms burst, yet let the churches but keep pace, in their efforts, with the plain indications of Providence, and ere long, the world will be filled with wonder at the extent and glory of the results.

Ordinations and Installations.

Oct. 25,—Rev. EDWARD FAIRCHILD was installed Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in Milford, N. Y. Sermon by Rev. J. Smith, of Cooperstown.

Dec. 1,—At Jeffersonville, Ind. Rev. SAMUEL E. BLACKBURN, as an Evangelist. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Williamson.

Dec. 1,—Rev. AMASA JEROME, was installed by the presbytery of Huron, over the Church in Wadsworth, Medina county, Ohio. Sermon by Rev. Giles H. Cowles.

Dec. 13,—Rev. CALEB KNIGHT was installed Pastor of the Congregational Church in Washington, Ms. Sermon by Rev. Dr. Knight, of Stafford, Con.

Dec. 20,—Rev. JOHN N. BROWN was installed as Pastor of the First Baptist Church in Malden, Mass.

Dec. 20,—Rev. JAIRUS BURT, over the Congregational Church in Canton, Conn. Sermon by Rev. Sylvester Burt, of Great Barington.

Dec. 23,—Rev. JOEL MANN, late of Bristol, R. I. was installed as Pastor of the First Congregational Church in Suffield, Conn. Sermon, by Rev. Mr. Vernon, of Rehoboth.

Dec. 24,—Rev. GILBERT R LIVINGSTON was installed Pastor of the First Reformed Dutch Church in Philadelphia. Sermon by Rev. President Miller, of Rutgers' College.

Dec. 27,—Rev. LINUS H. FELLOWS was ordained and installed over the Second Presbyterian Church and Society in Durham, N. Y. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Buck, of Knox, Albany county.

Jan. 3,—Rev. ELDERKIN J. BOARDMAN was installed Pastor of the Congregational Church in Danville, Vt. Sermon by Rev. Grant Powers, of Haverhill, N. H.

Jan. 3,—The Rev. JOHN TODD was ordained Pastor over the new Church in Groton, Mass. Sermon by Rev. Dr. Beecher.

Jan. 3,—The Rev. STEPHEN ALONZO LOPER was ordained Pastor of the Congregational Church in Hampden, Me. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Blood, of Bucksport.

Jan. 10,—Rev. NATHAN SHAW was installed Pastor of the North Church in Stockbridge, Ms. Sermon by Rev. Dr. Hyde, of Lee.

Jan. 17,—Rev. JACOB SCALES was installed Pastor of the Calvinistic Congregational Church in Henniker, N. H.

At Plastow, N. H. over the Congregational Church, which has been destitute twenty-five years, Rev. MOSES WELSH. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Gile, of Milton, Ms.

In Haverhill, Rev. MOSES C. GROSVENOR, as Pastor of the Congregational Church and Society in the West Parish. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Edwards, of Andover.

In New York, as Pastor of the Presbyterian Church and Congregation, Cedar street, Rev. CYRUS MASON. Sermon by the Rev. Dr. McAuley, from 2d Cor. 4, 5.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—*'W.' is received and will appear in our next number.*

THE

CHRISTIAN MAGAZINE.

VOL. IV. MARCH, 1827. No. 3.

SERMON.

TITUS, I. 15.—*Unto the pure all things are pure; but unto them that are defiled and unbelieving is nothing pure; but even their mind and conscience is defiled.*

ALL who call themselves orthodox Christians agree in the opinion, that mankind are by nature, in some manner and in some measure morally depraved. But they differ in respect to the nature, degree, and influence of native depravity. These peculiar properties of it are plainly suggested in the text. "Unto the pure all things are pure;" that is, unto true penitents or sincere believers; "but unto them that are defiled, and unbelieving, is nothing pure; but even their mind and conscience is defiled;" that is, the mind and conscience of unrenewed, unbelieving sinners. These words, without any further comment, clearly contain this important truth:

That all the *natural* powers and faculties of sinners are defiled or morally depraved.

I shall first consider what it is that morally defiles or depraves the natural powers and faculties of sinners; and then illustrate the truth of the general observation, that they are morally defiled or depraved.

I. Let us consider what it is, that morally defiles or depraves the *natural* powers and faculties of sinners. "But even their mind and conscience is *defiled*," says the text. The mind and conscience are natural faculties, and comprise all the natural powers of the soul; and these are morally defiled by something distinct from themselves: which naturally leads us to inquire what that is, which defiles or spreads a morally corrupting influence over them. To this it is easy to answer in general. It is the *heart*. The heart is the seat of all moral evil or depravity. The heart is the moral principle in the human soul, and the only moral principle in it. Though it contains various natural faculties and animal instincts and passions, yet these have no moral qualities attached to them. They are neither good nor evil, praise or blame worthy in a moral view. The heart, which consists of free, voluntary affections, is the seat or source of all that is morally good or evil in any moral agent. There is nothing, therefore, that can morally defile or deprave the natural powers and faculties of sinners, but their *hearts*, which are full of evil. This will appear if we consider,

1. That we never blame ourselves, or others, for any desire,

design, or action, which we believe did not flow from the badness of the heart. We never blame a blind man for not seeing, nor a deaf man for not hearing, nor a dumb man for not speaking, nor a lame man for not walking, nor a deranged man for not reasoning correctly, because none of these things are supposed to proceed from any evil affection of the heart. For the same reason, we never blame a man for having a weak capacity, nor any other man for not knowing or doing what he had no capacity or power of doing or knowing. We all know that the heathens are not guilty of disbelieving the gospel, which they never read, nor heard, because their unbelief cannot arise from any depravity of heart. If a man be arraigned before any civil judicature, and can make it appear to the judges, that he had no ill design in what he said or did, they will acquit him as innocent. It is the common sense of all men, that moral depravity or sinfulness, lies entirely in the heart, and consequently, that nothing but a corrupt heart can morally defile or deprave any of the natural powers and faculties of the mind.

2. The divine law requires nothing but a good heart, and forbids nothing but a bad heart, which implies that moral goodness and badness lies wholly in the heart, and not in the natural powers and faculties of the mind. The law says to every man, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and thy neighbor as thyself: on these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets." And says the Apostle, "If there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Love belongs to the heart, and not to the understanding, or any natural power or faculty. But if all holiness or moral virtue lies in the heart, then all sin or moral evil must lie in the heart. According to the divine law, all moral goodness consists in holy love, or true benevolence; and all moral evil consists in unholy love, or real selfishness. Nothing, therefore, but a selfish or corrupt heart can defile or morally deprave any of the intellectual powers of the mind. I may add,

3. The scripture represents the heart as the seat of all moral corruption and defilement. God declares the heart of sinners to be deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked. Solomon declares the hearts of the sons of men to be full of evil; and fully set in them to do evil. Every imagination of the thoughts in the heart of sinners is evil, only evil continually. In them, that is in their hearts there dwelleth no good thing. Accordingly, our Saviour declared, "Out of the *heart* proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies;" and these are the things, he said, which defile a man, or corrupt all his natural powers and external actions. This truth, I now proceed,

II. To illustrate and establish.

It is generally allowed, that the natural powers and faculties of the soul have been, some how or other, disordered and weakened, in consequence of the apostacy of Adam. The point now to be illustrated and established is, that all the intellectual powers of sinners, are morally depraved by the total depravity of their hearts. And this will appear, if we con-

sider each *natural* power distinctly.

1. The first in order is the *understanding*.

This is the mental faculty by which we discern, perceive, and distinguish the various objects presented to the intellectual eye. The total depravity of the heart, never fails to deprave and darken the understanding in respect to moral and divine objects. Hence, says the Apostle to the Ephesians, "Walk not as other Gentiles walk, in the vanity of their minds; having the *understanding* darkened, being alienated from the life of God, through the ignorance that is in them, *because of the blindness of the heart*." Agreeably to this, he says again, "The *natural* man, or sinner, receiveth not the things of the spirit of God, for they are *foolishness* unto him, neither can he *know* them, because they are *spiritually discerned*." Though the understandings of sinners are good in respect to natural objects, yet they are entirely blinded, by the total depravity of their hearts, in respect to the moral beauty, glory, and excellence of God and divine things. Though Satan, since his apostacy, still retains his superior *intellect*, and is as capable as ever he was, of seeing natural objects and gaining natural knowledge; yet he is wholly blind to the moral beauty of holiness in God and divine objects, through the total depravity of his *heart*. As the blindness of the natural eye darkens the understanding in respect to the beauty of natural objects, so the blindness of the heart darkens the understanding in respect to moral and divine objects. This our Saviour has clearly illustrated. He says, "The light of the body is the eye, if, therefore, thine eye be *single*, thy whole body shall be full of light, but if thine eye be *evil*, thy whole body shall be full of darkness." This was as much as to say, as it is by the eye a man sees the light of the sun, so it is by the heart, he sees the light of the knowledge of the glory of God; and as he cannot see the light of the sun, if his eye be blind; so he cannot see the beauty of holiness or the moral glory of God, if his heart be totally depraved. And here it may be further observed, as the ignorance of a blind man does not arise from any defect in his understanding, but entirely from the defect in his eyes; so the ignorance of sinners, in regard to God and divine things, does not arise from any defect in their understanding, but solely from the depravity of their hearts, which defiles, depraves, and darkens their understanding.

2. The total depravity of sinners defiles or depraves their natural faculty of *judgment*. This is their intellectual faculty, by which they compare various things together, and discover their likeness or unlikeness, their agreement or disagreement with each other. But their depravity of heart, defiles or corrupts this natural, mental faculty, and renders it partial and blind with respect to moral and religious objects. Solomon says, "A gift blindeth the wise;" so a depraved heart blinds the judgment, and makes it partial in its decisions and opinions in moral matters. Every one who is under the influence of a totally selfish heart, will be *partial* in judging of every subject and object respecting God and himself, and respecting himself and his fellow men. Selfishness will always dispose him to set his own interest too high, and

the interest of others too low. How often do we see selfishness warp the judgments of men, in regard to their worldly concerns? The law allows no man to sit in judgment in any case, in which his own interest is deeply implicated. Though a man has ever so clear and sound judgment, where his personal interest is not concerned, yet it is always to be suspected in judging of his own interest. And how much more does total depravity of heart, warp and blind the judgment of men, in respect to their spiritual and eternal interests? How often do sinners judge any unjust or injurious act done to themselves, as far more *criminal* than any unjust or injurious act done to God? How apt are they to think and say, that a *want* of a heart in others to love them, and to do them good, is no excuse; while they think and say, that a *want* of a heart to love and serve God, is a good excuse for their not loving and obeying him. Now what can be the cause of their judging so partially and unjustly in respect to their own moral characters and conduct? It cannot be owing to any weakness or deficiency in their *natural* faculty of judgment, but entirely owing to the total depravity of heart, which depraves and blinds their judgment. They have a clear and acute discernment of what is right and of what is wrong in themselves and others, where their own personal interest is not concerned. The total depravity of Saul's heart depraved and perverted his judgment, and made him think and say, that he had obeyed the voice of the Lord, when he had grossly disobeyed his express command. The depraved heart of every sinner leads him to judge amiss in respect to all moral conduct. His judgment is so warped and blinded by his heart, that he thinks he has done right, when he has done wrong, in innumerable instances. And he forms this judgment of his views, and feelings, and conduct, in his most sober moments. He has a beam in his own eye, while he verily thinks that he has not so much as a mote in it. The men of Israel were capable of judging righteous judgment between God and his vineyard; but their depraved hearts led them to think and say, that their ways were equal, but the ways of the Lord were unequal. It has always been found to be true, that the depraved hearts of sinners, have darkened, defiled, and perverted their judgment in respect to moral, spiritual, and divine things.

3. The depravity of heart in sinners has the same depraving and blinding influence upon their natural faculty of *reason*, as upon their natural faculties of understanding and judgment. By reason is meant that natural power of the mind, by which we compare, compound, and arrange our ideas upon any subject, and draw inferences or conclusions from them. The men of corrupt hearts can reason correctly upon the common objects, with which they are conversant, and the common pursuits and employments of life; yea, in regard to these things, they are said to be wiser than the children of light; but they are always disposed to reason erroneously upon spiritual and divine things. Hence they are so often styled *fools* by the sacred writers, notwithstanding their strong reasoning powers. David says in the 94th Psalm, "They break in pieces thy people, O Lord; and afflict thine heritage. They slay

the widow and the stranger and murder the fatherless.—Yet they say, *The Lord shall not see*, neither shall the God of Jacob regard it. Understand, ye brutish among the people: and ye *fools*, when will ye be wise? He that planted the ear, shall he not hear? he that formed the eye, shall he not see? he that teacheth man knowledge, shall he not know?" Isaiah says, "In that day did the Lord God of hosts call to weeping, and to mourning, and to baldness, and to girding with sackcloth: and behold, joy and gladness, slaying oxen and killing sheep, eating flesh, and drinking wine: *let us eat and drink; for to-morrow we shall die.*" Was this good reasoning? While God was calling them, by his judgments, to weeping and mourning; and threatening them with the marks of his severe and just displeasure, did they reason right, in saying, let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we shall die? Could any thing have been more absurd, foolish, and presumptuous, than to conclude it was best to spend their few last moments in aggravating their future and eternal destruction! Thousands of sinners have reasoned in this manner, and thousands are still reasoning in this manner. They say, since the period of childhood and youth is short, it is right and best to spend it in vanity. They say, since life is short, it is best to spend it in gaining the world. They say, since life is uncertain, it is best to seek present good, rather than future and eternal happiness. This is a very absurd inference from the *uncertainty* of life, and it appears so to sinners, in respect to their temporal concerns. They will not risk a very small proportion of their *property* upon the uncertainty of the lives of others. Though the future and eternal happiness of their souls is infinitely more important than their happiness in this present momentary life, yet they will, in the full vigor of their reasoning power, risk their future and eternal happiness, for the sake of the momentary and uncertain happiness of this present life. Dives was guilty of this folly. The man who laid up goods for many years, but lost them in an unexpected moment, was guilty of this folly. All sinners are guilty of this folly. Hence says Solomon, "Madness is in their hearts while they live, and after that they go to the dead." No man whose mind is deranged, ever reasoned so absurdly, as the wise men of the world reason, in respect to their future and eternal interests. They deliberately neglect and forfeit their future and eternal happiness, for the sake of enjoying this world for a short and uncertain season. Could we believe, if we did not know it, that those who deem themselves the wisest men in the world, are guilty of this extreme folly! Of all calculators, the wisest men in the world make the grossest blunders. Can this be owing to any thing but depravity of heart, which can pervert and blind the strongest and brightest reasoning powers?

4. The depraved hearts of sinners, defile and deprave their *memory*, as well as their underderstanding, judgment, and reason. Memory is that intellectual faculty, which is the repository of all our ideas. Through the depravity of the heart, this natural power of receiving, retaining, and recollecting our ideas, is impaired, weakened, and defiled. The heart has great influence in awakening and fixing the *attention* to *external* objects and *internal*

exercises and impressions. When we wish to remember any thing we have seen, or heard, or felt, we find it necessary to fix our attention upon that object to the exclusion of all others, and that for some space of time. When we wish to commit any thing we have read to memory, we find it necessary to read it repeatedly, or to revolve it in our minds repeatedly. Now, it is easy to see how the *heart* can affect the *memory*, either by awakening attention, or fixing attention, or diverting attention. When a person hears that which is agreeable to his heart, he wishes to remember it, and of course fixes his attention upon it, in order to remember it. Or when a person hears something which is disagreeable to his heart, he wishes to forget it, and endeavours to turn his attention from it, in order to forget it. Children love trifles, and therefore fix their attention upon them, and easily remember them. The men of the world, love the world, and the things of the world, and therefore fix their attention upon them, and remember them. But the men of the world hate God and divine things, and therefore they turn their attention from these disagreeable objects, and strive to forget them. Hence, sinners are said to forget God, and that God is not in all their thoughts. This is not owing to any defect or weakness in their natural faculty of memory, but to the entire depravity of their hearts, which defile and deprave their memory, in regard to God and every thing of a divine or a religious nature. They remember what they should forget, and forget what they should remember. Their memory is defiled by their hearts.

5. The depravity of sinners defiles and blinds their *conscience*. "Unto the pure, all things are pure: but unto them that are defiled, and unbelieving, is nothing pure; but even their mind and conscience is defiled." Conscience is that faculty of the mind, which approves what is right and condemns what is wrong; which approves of virtue, but condemns vice in every form, and which lays every man under moral obligation to pursue virtue, and avoid vice. This faculty always passes a true judgment upon every subject referred to it, according to the evidence exhibited. It is like a wise and just Judge, who will always determine impartially, according to the testimony of the witnesses. If they testify the truth, he will decide according to the truth. But as a just Judge may be misled by false testimony, so conscience may be misled by the depravity of the heart. The depraved hearts of sinners lead them sometimes to stifle the voice of conscience, and sometimes to misinform it, lest it should testify against them. Sometimes they refuse to consult conscience in respect to their sinful desires, designs, and pursuits, and so prevent its condemning them. And sometimes they endeavor to misinform conscience, by exhibiting false evidence, in respect to their sinful affections and actions. Paul misinformed conscience, when he thought he ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus. His heart defiled his conscience, and made it to pass a wrong judgment upon his conduct. He represented Christ as an impostor, and his conscience told him it was right to oppose an impostor. Thus the depravity of the heart corrupts, perverts, and defiles the under-

standing, the judgment, the memory, the reason, the conscience, the tongue, the lips, the mouth, the eye, or in a word, all the powers and faculties of both the body and mind. The corrupt hearts of sinners, defile them in every part.

IMPROVEMENT.

1. If what has been said be true; then blindness of mind is not the primary cause of moral depravity. The understanding cannot defile the heart, but the heart can defile the understanding. Many suppose, that blindness in the understanding is the primary cause of depravity in the heart. This is the opinion of all Arminians, and the first principle of their whole erroneous system. They say, that the understanding is the leading faculty in the human mind, and governs all their conduct. Dr. Price says, men always feel and act according to the dictates of their understanding, and never can act contrary to these dictates, or in other words, they always act as well as they know. He asserts, that no man can hate God, who has a true knowledge of his character; and that the only cause why mankind so generally hate him is their ignorance of his real character. But it appears from what has been said, that the heart is the primary source of all moral depravity, and the original cause of defiling and blinding the understanding, the judgment, the memory, reason, conscience, and every mental power and faculty. All men know by experience, that they are governed by their hearts, and not by their understandings, or any other natural faculty, in all their moral views, affections, and conduct; for they are conscious, that they too often act contrary to the dictates of their understanding, judgment, reason, and conscience, for which they feel guilty and self condemned; but they never blame themselves for acting agreeably to the dictates of their understanding, reason, and conscience. Men always justify themselves for whatever they do, under the influence of blindness or ignorance in their understanding or conscience. If sinners hated God merely because they are ignorant of his true character, then if this ignorance were removed, they would immediately know him, and consequently love him. But this is not true of sinners, that they would love God, if they only knew his true character. For our Saviour said of sinners in his day, "They have both *seen and hated* both me and my Father." Though sinners are really ignorant of God, yet their ignorance arises from the blindness of their *hearts*, and not from the blindness of their understanding. The Apostle says, "They are alienated from the life of God, through the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their *heart*." It is depravity of heart that blinds their understanding, and prevents their knowing and loving the glory of God, as displayed in the face of Jesus Christ. It is their heart that defiles and darkens their understanding, and not their understanding that darkens and blinds their heart.

2. If the enmity and disaffection of sinners towards God, be owing to the total depravity of their *heart;* then they cannot be regenerated or converted by mere moral suasion, or letting light into their understanding. Arminians, who maintain that sinners hate and oppose God because they are *ignorant* of his true character,

suppose that they may be renewed, converted, or reconciled to him, by mere moral suasion, or enlightening their understandings, without any divine agency or influence to change their hearts. This would undoubtedly be true, if their ignorance of God were entirely owing to any defect or blindness in their natural faculty of understanding. In this case, moral suasion, or the exhibition of divine truth, would remove the blindness and ignorance in their understanding, and reconcile and convert them to God. But the truth is, the blindness and ignorance of sinners, in regard to God and divine objects, is owing to the total depravity of their hearts, which no light in the understanding has a tendency to remove. Regeneration or the renovation of the heart cannot be effected by moral suasion or the exhibition of divine truth before the eyes of the understanding. If the mere exhibition of divine truth, could slay the enmity of a totally depraved heart, it seems that Satan and all the spirits in prison, must have been renewed and converted before this time; for they have had a full blaze of light let into their understanding and conscience. If the mere light of divine truth would change the depraved hearts of sinners, it is strange that Christ did not convert all who heard him preach, and that the Apostles did not convert all who heard them preach. Christ and the Apostles exhibited the greatest and most important truths of the gospel in the fullest and clearest light; but how few comparatively did they convert? If sinners could have as clear, full, and impressive views of God, and of all divine objects, as the angels of light, it would not serve to reconcile their hearts to God, but to increase their enmity and opposition to him. If this be true, it is certain to a demonstration, that Arminians do, to all intents and purposes, deny the true scriptural doctrine of Regeneration, by the direct agency and influence of the holy Spirit; and of course, that their whole scheme of doctrines is fundamentally and fatally false. The notion that moral depravity lies in the understanding, and not in the heart, is one of the most dangerous errors that has ever been imbibed and taught, for it opens the door to every false and fatal sentiment that has prevailed, and still prevails. Yet few seem to be alarmed at the spread of Arminianism, while they are deeply concerned about the spread of Unitarianism, and Universalism in every form. But I believe there are very few or any Unitarians or Universalists, but what are rank Arminians, and became Arminians before they became Unitarians or Universalists. Arminianism directly leads to Unitarianism and Universalism, and it must be owing either to indolence, incapacity, or fear, that every Arminian does not become a real Unitarian, and of course, a real Universalist. I am therefore greatly alarmed at the revival of old Arminianism. Some of the most distinguished ministers of the present day, who have been considered as highly orthodox, imbibe and teach the old Arminian doctrine, that sinners may be converted by mere moral suasion or exhibition of divine truth. They say if ministers would only preach the peculiar truths of the gospel plainly, powerfully, and constantly, they may and will convert those sinners who hear them. They say divine truth

alone will subdue and change the depraved hearts of sinners, without any special, direct, and efficient influence of the divine spirit, to turn them from sin to holiness, or from spiritual death to spiritual life. This is true, upon the first principle of Arminianism, but upon no other principle. If moral depravity lies in the understanding, and not in the heart, this is true; but if moral depravity lies entirely in the heart, it is false. And it appears from what has been said, that moral depravity lies wholly in the heart, that except a man be born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God, he cannot be saved.

3. If the depravity of sinners lies in their heart, and not in their understanding, then they never do any duty in the sight of God. Though they do such external acts of kindness and justice to their fellow-men, and though they do such external acts of obedience and devotion to God, as he has required, yet all their moral and religious acts flow from their depraved hearts, which defile their mind and conscience and affections and actions, and renders them displeasing to the holy eye and heart of God. Though they externally obey the dictates of their reason and conscience, and the precepts of the divine law, yet they perform no duty, because they do not act from true love to God or man. It is in vain for sinners to draw nigh unto God with their mouth, and honor him with their lips, while their heart is far from him. Solomon says, "He that turneth away his ear from hearing the law, even his prayer shall be an abomination." Paul before his conversion was strictly moral and devotional. He lived in all good conscience, and verily thought he did God service; yet all that while he performed not a single duty, which was acceptable to God, who looked on his totally depraved heart, and condemned every action which flowed from it. This he was fully convinced of afterwards, and condemned the best actions he had done under the influence of his totally depraved and selfish heart. He condemned all his selfish zeal and righteousness, as sinful, unprofitable, and odious. Sinners now are very apt to think with Paul, that they are doing God service, while they externally obey the precepts of his word, and the dictates of their conscience. How often do we hear them say, that they did such and such things because they thought it was their duty to do them? And how often do we hear them say, that they did not such and such things, because their duty would not allow them to do them? They often talk as freely and confidently of having done their duty, as good men do, by which they discover their ignorance of the truth contained in our text. "Unto the pure all things are pure: but unto them that are defiled, and unbelieving, is nothing pure; but even their mind and conscience is defiled." Good men do their duty by obeying the dictates of their conscience and the commands of God, from a pure, holy, obedient heart. To them all their holy affections and holy actions are pure. But the depraved hearts of impenitent and unbelieving sinners, defile all their affections and actions, and render them unholy, impure, and sinful. Let not sinners be deceived. God is not mocked. He has told them, that every imagination of the thoughts of their

heart, is evil, only evil continually.

4. It appears from what has been said, that the very persons of sinners are vile and odious in the sight of God. Though they may have distinguished intellectual powers, a refined education, and an amiable natural disposition, yet these are all depraved and defiled by the depravity of their *hearts*, and become offensive to the pure eyes of a holy, sin-hating God. Satan is possessed of all the intellectual powers and natural excellencies, with which he was endowed before he apostatised; but his depraved heart has defiled and depraved them, and rendered him the most vile and odious being in the universe. Total depravity of heart has the same demoralizing and debasing effect upon all sinners. The highest, richest, noblest sinner is more vile and odious than the meanest and vilest creature on earth. God employs some of the most striking images in nature, to represent their worthlessness, their vileness, and odiousness. He compares their worthlessness to the worthless *chaff* of the summer's threshing-floor. He compares their vileness to the animal that wallows in the mire. And he compares their odiousness to the stench and pollution of the graves of the dead. How vile was the beautiful Absalom! How vile was the knowing Balaam! How vile was the cruel Herod! How vile was the amiable young man, who chose to perish forever, rather than to give God and Christ the supreme affection of his heart! The heart of every sinner is totally depraved, and leads him to contend with his Maker forever, rather than to do the least duty he has enjoined upon him. It is true, sinners in general, wear a mask and hide the enmity of their hearts towards God, but he looks through their hearts, and abhors them for all their hostile and rebelious feelings and conduct. Fallen angels are called not only evil, but *foul* spirits, and fallen men in their native and completely depraved state, are equally vile, and foul, and odious in the eyes of perfect purity. From whence come all the wars and bloodshed among the nations of the earth? Come they not from the depravity and malignity of the human heart, which defile and pervert the noblest talents of the greatest prodigies of wickedness, and greatest destroyers of the peace and happiness of mankind? Must not the God of order, of peace, and of purity, abhor the persons as well as actions of such monsters in iniquity? But how much better are sinners in general than they? Not at all. For says the Apostle, "both Jews and Gentiles are all under sin. As it is written, there is none righteous, no, not one: There is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one. Their throat is an open sepulchre; with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips: whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness: Their feet are swift to shed blood: destruction and misery are in their ways; and the way of peace have they not known. There is no fear of God before their eyes." In such a vile and odious light, do the actions and persons of all sinners, without exception, appear in the sight of God. Hence,

5. It is the indispensable duty

of all sinners to view themselves as such vile and odious creatures; for it is true, that even their mind and conscience and all their intellectual faculties are defiled by the depravity of their *hearts*. They have abundant cause to loathe and abhor themselves, and to repent in dust and ashes. Their sins are immensely numerous and enormously great. They have acted as bad as they could, with their limited capacity and circumstances. They have injured God, and Christ, and the holy Spirit, and the great cause, which these divine persons have exerted their power, wisdom, grace, and justice in promoting. They are justly condemned already, and it becomes them to condemn themselves, and justify God in their condemnation, and accept the punishment of their iniquities, and cast themselves upon his sovereign mercy, through faith in the atoning blood of Christ. This duty has often been sounded in your ears, but has seldom reached your heart and conscience; but it must be understood, and felt, and performed, or you can never be saved. This duty must be inculcated upon you, for all your interests for time and eternity are suspended upon it. Be entreated not to neglect this duty any longer. Within a very short time, your doom may be irresistibly fixed, and you lost forever. To-day then review your hearts and your lives, become reconciled to God and secure the salvation of your souls.

Finally, this subject teaches the duty of saints. It becomes them to remember the distinguishing grace of God towards them, while they were sinning against him, and contending with him. It becomes them to walk softly and circumspectfully before him, lest they should become stumbling-blocks to sinners, and prove the occasion of their falling and perishing. It becomes them to grow in grace, to shine as lights in the world, and lead others to glorify their Father who is in heaven. This will prepare them for a peaceful death, and a blessed immortality beyond the grave.

For the Christian Magazine.

ETERNAL DEATH.

THE kinds of death spoken of in the scriptures, are commonly reckoned to be three; death temporal, death spiritual, and death eternal. Death temporal is the separation of soul and body. Death spiritual is a uniform and confirmed course of transgression; in other words, it is to be "dead in trespasses and sins." And death eternal is that future and everlasting punishment, which every sinner deserves. Under one or another of these three classes, it is believed every passage of scripture, in which the word death is used, may be fairly ranked; if we except indeed a very few, in which it is used in an obviously and highly figurative sense.

Some have considered this enumeration of the different kinds of death, unsatisfactory; especially as it includes *eternal* death. They have denied that any such kind of death is spoken of in the scriptures, or will ever be realized by the abandoned of our race. The candid and dispassionate, who entertain this view of the subject, (for others it is hopeless to attempt convincing,) are invited to a consideration of the following classes of scriptures, in which the word death is used. And,

1. Those, in which a certain kind of death is *contrasted* with

ternal life.—"As sin hath reigned unto *death*, even so grace might reign, through righteousness, unto *eternal life*, by Jesus Christ our Lord."—"The *end* of those things" (sinful practices) "is *death*; but now, being made free from sin, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the *end*, *everlasting life*. For the wages of sin is *death*; but the gift of God is *eternal life*, through Jesus Christ our Lord."—The death spoken of in these passages is set, in every instance, in close and immediate *contrast* with eternal life. Consequently it must be the *opposite* of eternal life; that is, it must be *eternal death*.

2. Eternal death is intended in those passages, in which the *wicked* are represented as *exposed to a certain kind of death*, to which the righteous are not exposed. As a specimen of the numerous passages, in which this representation is made, I may refer the reader to the 18th and the 33d chapters of Ezekiel. God here urges, in every needful form of expression, again and again, that those who persevere in holiness shall *live*; while those who decline to the paths of sin, and persist in them, shall *die*. But what is the death here intended? What kind of death is it, to which the wicked are exposed; but from which the righteous are exempt? Not *temporal* death, surely: For to this, both the righteous and the wicked are exposed alike. Neither is it *spiritual* death: For to this the wicked are not *exposed*—they are already *involved* in it. They are already "dead in trespasses and sins." What death then is it, so frequently mentioned, in the chapters to which I have referred? To this question, the ingenuity of man can furnish but one answer—it is *eternal death*—that death, which is spoken of by the Apostle, as the proper wages and desert of sin.

3. Eternal death is intended in all those scriptures, in which sinners are exhorted to *rescue themselves* from their exposure to death.—"I have set before you, this day, life and death, blessing and cursing; therefore, *choose life*, that thou and thy seed may live." "Make ye a new heart, and a new spirit; for *why will ye die*, O house of Israel?" "Turn ye, turn ye, from your evil ways, O house of Israel; for *why will ye die?*"—But what is the death here intended, to which sinners are exposed, and from which they are exhorted to save themselves, by repentance and reformation? Not *temporal* death: For from *this*, repentance will not save them. Neither is it *spiritual* death: For to this, the wicked are not *exposed*—they have *already fallen under its power*. In regard to *this* kind of death, there would be no propriety in saying to them, "Why *will* ye die?" for they are *already* "*dead* in trespasses and sins." The inference therefore is unavoidable——the death here intended, which the wicked are exposed to suffer for their sins, and from which they can be saved, only by repentance and reformation, is *eternal death*.

4. Eternal death is intended in those passages, which speak of a sin as *unto death*—which is never to be forgiven—and for the forgiveness of which the people of God are not required to pray.—"If any man see his brother sin a sin which is not unto death, he shall ask, and he shall give him life for them that sin not unto death. *There is a sin unto death*: I do not say that he shall pray for it. And there is a sin not unto death." The distinguishing mark

of the sin here spoken of is, that it is "*unto death;*" or that it must inevitably terminate in a certain kind of death. But what kind of death is intended? What death is it, in which the dreadful sin here spoken of is sure to terminate, and which renders those who have committed it, no longer the proper subjects of prayer? It cannot be *temporal* death: For this is a fruit of all sin; and it is no reason why persons should not be prayed for, that they are exposed, in *this* sense, to die. Neither can it be *spiritual* death: For this is the state of all persons, previous to repentance; and if none may be prayed for, who are in this state, then no impenitent sinner is entitled to the prayers and supplications of the saints. The death intended must then be *eternal death.* In this, the sin spoken of is sure to terminate—it hath no forgiveness—and consequently prayer, for those who have committed it, must be improper and vain. I observe again,

5. Eternal death is intended in those passages of the Revelation which speak of the *second death.* "He that overcometh, shall not be hurt of the *second death.*"—"Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the *second death* hath no power." It might be shown conclusively, from the passages themselves, that the death, here spoken of, is not temporal, or spiritual, but *eternal death.* But on this point, we are not left to mere inference. "I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened, and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life, was *cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death.*"—"But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone—*which is the second death.*" From these passages, we *know*, that the second death is *eternal death.* It is that fearful and eternal punishment, which is reserved for the finally impenitent, beyond the grave.

There are many other passages of scripture, besides those here referred to, in which mention is made of eternal death. But these are such as will not admit of any other interpretation. They speak, not only a language which can be understood, but which, by the candid, cannot be misunderstood. And they assure us, on the highest authority on earth, or in heaven, that impenitent, incorrigible sinners must suffer hereafter the pains and agonies of *eternal death.*

With a single inference, I dismiss the subject. *Universalism*, in all the variety of shapes it has ever assumed, or is capable of assuming, *is without foundation.* It may gratify, for a few days, a depraved heart; but it will inevitably cheat and destroy the soul.

W.

From the Utica Christian Repository.

THE PILGRIM'S PROGRESS IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.—BY BUNYANUS.

CHAPTER XV.

Then Stephanus related his history, as follows:

I was born in this place, of parents who kept this house before me; and was early taught to read the King's statute book, and to listen to the instructions of the King's ambassadors. Nothing worthy of being mentioned oc-

curred in the early part of my life, till I was of age; only, that I was quite weary of this valley, and of such a retired life as my parents led, and longed to see more of the world. I had become also very neglectful of the King's book, which I avoided when I could, and was quite averse to religious instruction.

When I was of age, I went first to the town of Vanity, where I resided a few years. And here, though I was much engaged in the business of the fair, my religious education operated as a restraint upon me, so that I did not feel any inclination to join in many of the practices which are common there. Yet, by degrees, the restraints I had felt became less, and I began to associate with several young men of loose principles and vicious habits, and to spend my leisure hours in their company. Still, however, I was resolved to maintain a fair character among men, and to avoid any practice which was esteemed disreputable. And I also spent a considerable portion of my time in reading such books as fell in my way.

Being intent on rising in the world, and watching for an opportunity to advance myself, I readily embraced an occasion of going to the city of Destruction, and engaging in business there, which I flattered myself would be more profitable. I continued there also several years, without any material change in my circumstances. I tasted of the streams of sensual pleasure; but the waters made me sick and I refrained. I dug in the mines of worldly gain, but without much success. I was most desirous of climbing the hill of worldly honor. I looked at those who were ascending, and envied them the distinction they had attained. But the crowd of those who were pushing forward, and endeavoring to climb, was so great, that I could not make my way through them, even to the foot of the hill.

During my stay there, I had generally neglected to hear any of those who are called the ambassadors from the King, and spent my time in business or amusement. Yet I still intended to go on pilgrimage at some future day. One day Conscience came in, and told me plainly that I was exposed to the wrath of the King; and that there was no way to escape it, but by leaving that place. So I promised him that I would leave the place, and set out on pilgrimage; and with that he seemed pacified and left me. Then, after some time, he called again, and spoke in a more menacing manner, threatening me with speedy death, if I did not hasten out of the city. At this I was considerably alarmed, and packing up my effects, I removed to the town of Morality, and resided next door to Mr. Legality, with whom I was much pleased.

Not seeing any thing of Conscience for some time, however, and still feeling an inclination to spend some longer time in the city, I returned thither, and resumed my old occupation. But, to keep up the appearance of some respect to religious things, I attached myself to the parish of Dr. Smoothman, on whose preaching I attended constantly, and was for some, time well satisfied with it. He taught, that if we led a sober, regular life, went constantly to church, were honest in our dealings, kind to the poor, and did not fall into any disreputable practices, nor any violent

out-breaking sins, all would be well with us, though we never left the city.

But, although I was well pleased with such instructions, as being well suited to the inclinations of my heart, I could not entirely believe them.—For, I had been too well acquainted with the King's book in my youth, though I had neglected it now for some years, not to know that it was necessary to enter the wicket gate, and go on pilgrimage. So I began to fear, lest, if I continued to attend his preaching, I should be persuaded to give up all thoughts of going on pilgrimage, and ultimately perish with the city. I then left his parish, and joined that of Dr. Soothing, who was understood to be in favor of the pilgrim's life. Under his preaching I was better satisfied; for I did not know enough, then, to perceive that it was even more dangerous than that of Dr. Smoothman. For though it had more of the semblance of truth, by which it was more likely to gain confidence, it was still radically wrong.

He said very little in any of his discourses, that was calculated to disturb our peace, and make us sensible of our danger and guilt. When he introduced such subjects as depravity, atonement, regeneration, and the like, he did it in a manner so gentle, and kind, and tender, that no one could be offended; and treated them in such general terms, that no one could tell what were his precise views of them. But from his general manner of preaching, I soon got the idea that my depravity was inherited from my forefathers, and was rather to be looked upon as a calamity than a fault; that it was what I could not help; that none could set out on pilgrimage till the King should please to send a messenger to carry him through the gate; and that it was my duty to wait patiently the King's time, and be in the use of certain means to obtain the King's favor, which, if persevered in, would certainly obtain it. So I began to use the means he pointed out, such as reading the King's book, attending constantly at church, and praying to the King after my manner. And I did all this the more readily, because I found it did not interfere with my love of the world, nor my supreme regard to my own happiness: but that the latter especially, was fostered and encouraged by it.

In this manner I went on for some time, and began to think I was in a very good way, and had become a much better man. But, at a certain time, I mingled with a crowd to hear Evangelist preach, being chiefly moved by curiosity to hear one that was so much spoken against. I do not recollect his text, nor the outlines of his sermon; but I well remember that his discourse contradicted nearly all the opinions I had embraced. He taught that we are both active and dependant in all that we do; that our depravity is voluntary, and consequently not our calamity, but our crime; that repentance is the immediate duty of sinners, and that they have no excuse for delaying it a moment; that all selfishness is sin, that love to God, to be genuine, must be for what he is in himself, and not for what we expect to gain by it; that we must cease to make our happiness our supreme object, and make the glory of the King our ultimate end in all that we do; that going through the gate must be our own act, and that none would

ever get through in any other way; that we must pray to the King with the prayer of love, and repentance, and faith; and that all prayer without love, repentance, and faith, is an abomination to the King; that sinners are condemned already, and the wrath of the King is abiding upon them; and that we must deny ourselves, submit to the King, accept the punishment of our iniquity, and put ourselves into his hands to be disposed of at his sovereign pleasure. These were some of the leading ideas of Evangelist's discourse; and I no longer wondered why he was every where spoken against. I could not bear it better than others, and resolved never to hear him again.

On returning home, however, I was so uneasy, that I thought I would take the King's book, and find passages to refute the hated doctrines. So I searched some time, but did not get any satisfaction, because I found more that seemed to favor what Evangelist had said, than I could against it. So I went to Dr. Soothing, and told him my difficulties. He told me that he rather thought Evangelist was a good man, but very imprudent, and always carrying things to extremes; that those things were points of a doubtful, metaphysical, or speculative nature, mere theories, difficult to be understood, and quite unnecessary; that he wondered Evangelist would be always feeding his hearers with strong meat, and have no more regard to their venial prejudices; that no other ambassador of the King in our whole city thought it necessary to preach so; that he had made himself unpopular through his own fault; and that he wondered any would continue to hear him. He concluded by exhorting me to let these points alone, and go on in my old course of using means to induce the King to send his agent to carry me through the gate, and to wait patiently the King's time. I observed that he seemed unusually moved while saying these things, and to lose his wonted mildness, and gentleness, and tenderness, and to be almost as much displeased with Evangelist and his doctrines, as I was myself. I was gratified with this; but yet I was disappointed that I got no aid from him towards refuting those odious doctrines, and thought that in this instance he carried his prudence as much too far, as Evangelist did his doctrines.

After this, I continued to attend the same round of duties, as I then supposed them; but with less satisfaction. My peace had been disturbed, and I felt restless and uneasy. Sometimes I went to hear Mr. Save-all, who plainly told us there was no burning pit beneath our city, and that all would be received into favor at last. I should have been glad to embrace his doctrines, and tried for some time to do so; but I saw too much in the King's book against them. Sometimes I went to hear Mr. Lawless, who taught that the Prince Immanuel had obeyed the law of the King in our behalf, and suffered its penalty for us; and thus had wrought out a finished righteousness which was transferred to such as would only believe it to be theirs; that no acts of repentance, nor love, nor obedience, of ours, were of any use, nor furnished any evidence in favor of those who performed them. The only thing he exhorted us to do, was to believe that the Prince Immanuel had taken all our sins, and given

us all his righteousness; but he admitted at the same time, that there was no evidence on which we were to believe this, either from the King's book, or from any other source. "You must work it out in yourselves," said he, "by the assistance of the agent of the King." And he said, "It is not true, before you believe it, but it becomes true when you do believe it." I tried for awhile, to work myself up into this belief; but I found I could not believe any thing, without some evidence, real or supposed, that the thing I believed was true before I believed it, and would remain true, whether I believed it or not: So I deserted him.

At length, Mr. Blind-guide came along; and I went to hear him. The greatest part of his discourse was directed against what he supposed Evangelist to teach, though he made but poor work in stating what it was, and poorer still in refuting it. But when he came towards the close, he undertook to tell us what was the way of escaping the destruction to which we were exposed in the city, and of reaching the celestial country. He said, there was *a way into the way*, to which he could direct inquirers, which was at once both safe and easy; and exhorted all to prepare to leave the city immediately, and to take directions from him. I was pleased to hear him oppose Evangelist, and to hear of a safe and easy way into the way, which I might take when I should be disposed to set out; which, however, I was not yet inclined to do.

Not long after, I heard that Evangelist was to preach again; and though I hated the man, and hated his doctrines, yet I concluded I would hear him once more, in the hope he would say something which would give me a better opportunity of refuting him, at least to my own satisfaction. So I heard him. And on this occasion he drew such a picture of the depravity of my heart, of its enmity to the King, its hatred of the truth, its opposition to the King's way of salvation, its love of error, and of the various ways I had taken to quiet my own mind, and fortify it against the truth, that I verily thought his whole discourse was aimed at me, and that some one had been telling him all about me. I was full of rage; and determined, that, as soon as he dismissed the meeting, I would go up to him, and vent my displeasure at him, for thus exposing me before the whole assembly. I went up to him accordingly, and asked him, who had been giving him an account of me. With that he looked gravely at me, and said, "I know you not. No one has told me any thing about you. But, if the character which has been described is yours, take heed that the end which has been described be not yours also." I was so struck with this reply, that, ashamed and confounded, I slunk away, without saying any thing more to him.

As soon as I had returned home, Conscience came in, and reiterated what Evangelist had said, threatening me, at the same time, with the vengeance of the King, if I did not immediately set out on pilgrimage. So I resolved to go; but went first to Dr. Soothing, my minister, for some directions. He repeated the directions I had received from him before. I told him I had been following them a long time, and yet my danger seemed to increase:

I now found myself more wicked than I had supposed I was, and was afraid I should yet perish. He asked me if I did not desire to escape from the wrath to come, I told him I did. Then, said he, if you have such a desire, it is the King who has given it to you, and his giving it to you is an indication that he intends to gratify it. I plainly perceive, that he has begun a good work in you; and I have no doubt but that he will carry it on, in his own due time. "He that desires to repent, does it already, in some measure." You have made a hopeful beginning. Only continue on in the use of means, and all will be well. I heard him respectfully, and took my leave, with a painful sense that his encouragements and directions did not suit my case, and that if I depended on them I should inevitably be lost.

My sense of danger being too great to permit me to rest, I went to Mr. Blind-guide, to inquire about the way into the way, of which he had spoken. Then he called for one to be my guide till I should get into it, whose name he said was Repentance, but I afterwards learned that his true name was False-repentance. This guide conducted me up the hill of Selfish-sorrow, near mount Sinai, whose thunders increased my terror, and made me hasten up the hill. Then he took me to a gate, which he said was the gate of Experience, but I afterwards found its true name to be the gate of Delusion. So I knocked, and the gate was opened by a man whose name is Self-confidence. Then my conductor left me, telling me I was now in the way into the way, and that I should have no further need of his services.

So the man who opened the gate took me into his house, and lodged me all night, for it was now towards evening. I inquired of him the name of the village, and he said it was called Peace-in-believing; but I have since learned that its true name is False-peace. He told me, moreover, that now, since I was in the way into the way, there was no particular occasion for my going on; and as he was in want of one to assist him, in attending on his company, with which his house was thronged, he would gladly take me into his service for a season; and when I thought proper I could proceed on my journey; to which proposal I willingly agreed.

With this man I remained several months; and saw and conversed with his guests, among whom I found a great variety of characters and opinions. But in one thing they all agreed: Their religion was wholly selfish; their own happiness was their only motive in wishing to leave the city of Destruction, and go on pilgrimage. And in this respect they all agreed with me too, as my feelings then were.

While here I learned that this way into the way leads from the house of Mr. Self-confidence to a certain stile, which is there called Assurance-of-hope, by which it enters the King's high way, beyond the house of the Interpreter. It is the same stile by which your late companions entered, and to prevent mistakes has its true name marked on it, as you saw, on the high way side, by order of the King. This way is so contrived that those who travel it shall not have an opportunity to call at the house of the Interpreter, with whom those who made it do not wish travellers to become acquainted. And Mr. Self-confi-

dence boasts that his house contains more curiosities and affords better instruction than the house of the Interpreter, who, he says, is now in his dotage. And as the house of the Interpreter has its significant rooms, so has the house of Mr. Self-confidence. But with the latter, the significant rooms are the rooms in which his guests are lodged for the night.

These lodging rooms have different names, according to their different properties. One is named the chamber of *Vision*, another the chamber of *Impulse*, another the chamber of *Scripture* another the chamber of *Dreams*, and the like. And I remarked that those who lodged there chose the different rooms, according to their own taste. Those who lodged in the chamber of Vision, always saw some wonderful sights, of a significant kind. Sometimes they saw the Black Tyrant coming towards them, with his grim attendants ready to seize them; and just when they thought they were about falling into his hands, they saw a company of shining ones coming to their relief, at sight of whom the Black Tyrant and his troop would flee away. Sometimes they saw the fiery pit opening its jaws, and felt themselves sinking into it; and when it seemed just ready to close upon them, they saw the Prince Immanuel flying swiftly towards them, and taking them up in his arms, and carrying them upward into the bright regions of celestial day. Sometimes they saw themselves standing before an inexorable judge, who with frowning aspect, was pronouncing upon them the sentence of condemnation; and then they saw his Son standing by, with a benignant smile, interposing in their behalf, and pleading for their pardon, pointing to his bleeding wounds. Sometimes they saw a vision of the Celestial City in all its brightness, and the Prince Immanuel sitting upon his throne of glory, looking at them with a smile, and beckoning them to come up thither.

Sometimes they saw the Prince Immanuel hanging upon the cross, with the blood streaming from his wounded hands and pierced side, and could discern their names written upon his heart. These and similar sights, in almost endless variety, were common to those who lodged in that chamber.

Those who lodged in the chamber of Dreams, usually had dreams of such like things as were seen by those who lodged in the chamber of Vision. Those who lodged in the chamber of Impulse, had certain mysterious impressions made upon their minds, which they could not describe to others, but which they themselves seemed perfectly to understand. Those who lodged in the chamber of Scripture, heard certain texts of scripture repeated to them; such as "Be of good cheer; thy sins are forgiven thee;"—"Why tarriest thou? arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins;"—"Go thy way; for God now accepteth thy works;"—and the like.

And in the morning, when the guests came together, it was customary for each one to relate what vision, or dream, or impulse, each had had the preceding night, or what text of scripture he had heard pronounced; and to tell what the import of it was; for they always appeared to know, better than another person could tell them, what the meaning was. And after long acquaintance there, I found that each one had such a kind of vision, or dream, or im-

pulse, or heard such a kind of text of scripture, as he wished for, when he retired. And I have since found, that those who lodge there, always remember these visions, or dreams, &c. and frequently tell them on their journey, and rely upon them as their chief passport at the celestial gate.

So after I had remained some time at the house of Mr. Self-confidence, he was so well pleased with my services, that he began to tell me that I should make an excellent guide to pilgrims, if I only had a call to that work, and might be of great assistance to Mr. Blind-guide in persuading the inhabitants of the city of Destruction to set out on pilgrimage. And he advised me to take up my lodging one night in one of the significant chambers, that I might know whether I was called or not. Accordingly I resolved to comply with his advice, and selected the chamber of Scripture, inwardly wishing that I might have a call to the work. During the night, I heard a voice saying unto me, "Go thy way; for the Lord hath sent thee." Then, in the morning, I told what I had heard, and Mr. Self-confidence, and all that were there agreed with me, that this was a sufficient call. So I went immediately to Mr. Blind-guide, and told him what had happened, and he gave me the right hand of fellowship to take part with him in his work; and added many instructions and directions how I might proceed most successfully.

In connection with Mr. Blind-guide I continued some time, copying his manner, and following his directions, with no small degree of self-complacency, and being much puffed up with the commendations I received. At length I found myself puzzled with several things which those with whom I conversed cited out of the King's book against what I taught. So I called on Mr. Blind-guide, and cited several of those passages, and got his explanations. But when I came to ask him what I should do with such passages as these, "As many as were *ordained* to eternal life believed," and the like, he had nothing to say, only that it was his advice that I should have nothing to do with them, but keep as far from them as possible. This startled me: for I believed that the King's book was the only rule of truth and duty; and I concluded, that if the system he and I were teaching made it necessary to keep as far as possible from any part of the King's book, we must be so far wrong.

I was thus led to examine that book more carefully than I had done; and the result was, a deep conviction, that as all my religion had been selfish, it had been all wrong; and that I hated the true character of the King with all my heart. This conviction filled me with deep distress, and led me again to hear and converse with Evangelist; soon after which I entered the wicket gate, with such feelings as you have described, and came on my way. At the Interpreter's house, I was further instructed in the King's book, and more accurately understood the delusion by which I had so long been blinded. At the village of Careless, I was persuaded to stop and hear Mr. Self-conceit; and was, for a time, imposed upon by his professions of unbounded charity. But I had become too much attached to the King's book, and read in it too constantly to be long deceived by

him. At the new house, I made a short stop, but long enough to understand that the inhabitants of it were not friendly to the Lord of the way. At the house Beautiful, I spent some time very agreeably; and then came on to this place, where my aged parents received me joyfully, as a returning prodigal. Here I have continued ever since, and when my parents were called hence to the Celestial City, I succeeded them in their house and employment. BUNYANUS.

ERRATA.—The following correction of the 13th chapter of the Pilgrim's Progress, published in our last volume, was not at the time observed.—Vol. 3, page 367, col. 1, line 33, for *I mean*, read *I may mean*. Page 368, after the 3d line in the 4th paragraph, insert, *But I know I am a christian; and therefore I know it is not true.*

For the Christian Magazine.

THE PENITENTIARY SYSTEM.

MUCH complaint has been made, of late, in regard to the construction and management of prisons—especially those intended for the reformation of convicts. Persons of different ages and circumstances, who are unequally hardened and skilled in crime, are not sufficiently distinguished and separated. Numbers, at night, are lodged in the same cells; and the prisoners generally are allowed too free an intercourse, one with another. An opportunity is thus furnished and improved, for a mutual influence of the very *worst* kind to be exerted. Practices the most detestable and abominable are shamelessly perpetrated.—Those who are older and more experienced in wickedness, instruct the younger in their various arts; place before them examples of the utmost enormity; and allure them onward, by every method in their power, to greater degrees of hardihood and villany. In this way, prisons and penitentiaries become the receptacles and nurseries of vice and crime, rather than houses of correction and reformation.

I have introduced this subject merely for the purpose of illustrating another. There are those who regard the *prison of hell*, as a vast house of correction——a place, where the *penitentiary system* is pursued upon a large scale. "All must be brought to repentance, sooner or later; and those, who are not humbled and reclaimed in the present world, must be punished in the fires of hell, till they are reclaimed."—Waving all other objections to this antiscriptural doctrine; why—let it be seriously asked—why should any be sent to the *prison of hell*, in order to bring them to repentance? A more unfavorable situation for such an object cannot possibly be imagined. What is the *society* of hell? What are the *employments?* What is the *influence* there exerted, by one being upon another? Who would think of placing a person, who was inclined to vicious practices in this world, in the company, and under the influence, of the notoriously vicious and abandoned, in order to reclaim him? Who would think of turning over a vicious *youth*, to the instruction and example of those who were old and hardened in crime and sin, in order to bring him to repentance? Much less can it be believed, that God will ever send any of his creatures to *hell*—where every heart overflows with enmity, and every mouth is filled with cursing, and every breath of influence is adverse to the spiritual good of the soul—in order to bring them to repentance;—that he will ever take any out of this

world, because they cannot be reclaimed here, and place them in the society, and under the instruction and example of devils and damned spirits—the oldest and most flagrant of all transgressors—in order that they may be turned from their wicked ways, and brought to the exercise of holiness!—No, my dear reader, if you and I ever repent, we shall repent in this world. If we are ever brought to the knowledge of the truth, the work will be accomplished here. Hell is no place for the production of such a change; or indeed of any, that will at all better our condition. The progress of every thing in that world, is downward. Every inhabitant is sinking; and is doomed, from the necessity of his condition, to sink—in sin, in misery, and despair—forever. W.

For the Christian Magazine.

HOW TO OBTAIN A GOOD HOPE OF SALVATION.

THE question is often proposed, and more often felt, by the anxious sinner, 'how shall I obtain the hope of salvation; even the *good* hope of the real christian?' To this, he not only needs, but often desires, a faithful answer. And the present object is, to meet, and as far as I am able, to answer this question. The sum of the answer is contained in the following passage of scripture. "Be ye holy in all manner of conversation: Because it is written, Be ye holy for I am holy." 1 Peter, i. 15, 16. Here, then, is the command of God, and the reason of the command. It applies to all men: it requires all men to be holy, in all manner of conversation. It thus meets the case of every anxious sinner; and teaches him the way, and the only way, to obtain a good hope of salvation. It meets him *as* a sinner; and teaches his *duty* as a sinner. But does he ask, what is *implied* in being thus holy? And *how* this will give him a good hope of salvation? I will attempt to answer these questions.

I. What is *implied* in being thus holy? Here I need not inform such persons that they *are* sinners: they know it already. For I now speak of those, who are *convinced* of sin, and are asking the question, "What must I do to be saved?" In describing holiness, then, as it relates to them, and indeed to all men, I remark, that it implies,

1st. *Genuine repentance* for sin. This embraces, not only a conviction of the reality and guilt of sin, but *genuine sorrow* for it, as an evil in itself. It is something, essentially different from a mere conviction of the *danger* of sin; or of an exposure to *punishment* for it, though this may attend it. Repentance leads the sinner to look, not directly at the *consequences* of sin, as they repect himself, but, at the *vileness* and *guilt* of it, as an offence against God. It leads him to *confess*, not merely his danger, but his vileness and guilt; to *condemn himself;* and thus to join with the *law of God*, in condemning him. It does all this, aside from the danger of punishment. It is not *intended*, to purchase his release from punishment. It aims at sin itself. The real penitent is *humble* for sin; he is deeply abased *before God*, filled with shame and sorrow, because he has dishonoured and offended *him*. This is repentance. And it is a holy exercise. It embraces love to God, and a resolution henceforth to forsake sin. It allows no re-

serve for the future commission of it, could this be done without danger; and thus, no justification of it. And so far as repentance is concerned, this *alone* is real holiness. The sinner can have no decisive *evidence* of holiness, until he has this repentance. For, until he has this, he is not *reconciled to God*, nor to the *law* of God; and, therefore, cannot be pardoned in view of the law. But this is not *all* that pertains to holiness. In connexion with this, it implies,

2dly. *Faith in Christ.* I am here describing the exercises and *evidences* of holiness, as these are required in the word of God. And of *sinners*, one of the first is faith in Christ; I mean "faith which worketh by love." For God has set Him forth, a propitiation, through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins; and has *commanded* them to believe in him, and submit to him, as their Saviour. Now, when they have this faith, they *do* believe in him, and submit to him. They renounce their own works, as the ground of their justification: they consent to the law, that it is just and good, though it condemns them: and then, receiving his atonement as the ground of their justification, they make him "the *end of the law for righteousness.*" And so far as faith is concerned, until they do this, they cannot have decisive *evidence* of holiness, nor a good hope of salvation. A mere belief in his existence and attributes is no decisive evidence. Wicked men, *often* have, and the devils *always* have, this belief. This alone is not *submission* to him: it implies no *trust* in him, nor *acceptance* of him, as a Saviour. It is not reconciliation to the law, nor to the gospel.

But the faith, here intended, implies *love*, and *works* by love. It thus leads men to comply with the self-abasing and humbling *terms*, on which salvation is offered: terms, which exalt and honor God, and lay men prostrate at his footstool. It is, therefore, a *holy* exercise. It unites the believer to Christ, and at the same time, evinces a readiness to serve and obey him. These, if I may so express it, are *first principles* of holiness. But they are not the whole. It extends to all manner of conversation. And therefore implies,

3dly. *Uniform obedience* to the *commandments* of God. In reference to this point, one of its most perfect definitions is, "This is the love of God, that we *keep his commandments*, and his commandments *are not grievous.*" Holiness is a *living* principle. It is not a flush of mere animal passion, which lives and operates, while men feel their danger, and dies as soon as they obtain the hope of salvation. When men become holy, and feel the *influence* of it, they are uniformly obedient, not to the impulse of their own fancy, but to the commandments of God. They make Jehovah their *only* God: they reverence his name, his Sabbaths, and his sanctuary: they do justice and show benevolence to their fellow-men. They obey also the precepts of Christ: they make these the supreme law of their religion. Hence, when matured in the *knowledge* of Christ, they are decided and persevering, in the path of duty, *already revealed to them:* they are frequent and fervent in prayer, they are humble, patient, thankful, forgiving,

and benevolent, faithful in the family, and among their friends and neighbours: active and animated in revivals of religion; and daily devoted to the service of Christ. This is the reason, why they often appear so *singular;* so indifferent to mere human maxims; so regardless, as others imagine, of their reputation or popularity among wicked men; and yet so decided and at the same time consistent; though as some say, bigoted, in matters of religion. They are under the law to Christ. And to please him, and maintain a good name *before him*, they dare, in these things, to appear *singular*, in the view of men. This is holiness, in reference to obedience. And if men would obtain decisive *evidence* of it, and a good hope of salvation, they must yield this obedience to the commandments of God. I also remark,

4thly. That holiness implies submission to the *Providence* of God. His word and Providence are the great means of the *trial* of Christian character. All the events of time are his Providences; and are to be understood as such. For he "worketh all things after the counsel of his own will." Many of these events, at the time, are unwelcome, and even painful, to those affected by them: such as disappointments, losses, bereavements, and other evils. They are *trying* to the hearts, even of good men, and equally so to the hearts of others. But holiness implies *submission* to these trials, as the dispensations of a wise Providence. Though they are painful, and are *intended* to be painful at the time, yet holiness will lead men to say with Eli, "It is the Lord, let *him* do what seemeth him good." It will, in the issue, produce reconciliation, under the sharpest trials, and lead men to say with Job, "Though he slay me, yet will I trust in him." Hence, if they would maintain decisive *evidence* of holiness, and a *good* hope of salvation, under these trials, they must *submit* cheerfully to the Providence of God. The religion, which does not produce this, is not the religion of the Bible. It cannot impart the *hope* of salvation, which is sure and steadfast. For, until men submit to all these trials, as well as repent, and believe, and obey the gospel, they are not *holy* in *all* manner of conversation: they have not submitted in *all* things to the will of God.—These are some of the leading features of holiness: they are essential, to constitute the proper evidence of it, and to lay the foundation of a *good* hope of salvation. I proceed, then,

II. To show *how* this will give them a good hope of salvation. In the 1st place, it will prepare them for *acceptance* with God. His command is *just.* They are under *obligation* to be holy in all manner of conversation. For *God* is holy. His moral excellence consists in his holiness. And it is just and even *necessary*, that men should be holy, that they may be *like* him, and thus be prepared for acceptance with him. He cannot consistently *accept*, nor approve them, until they become holy. They are not fit to be pardoned nor accepted: they are enemies and rebels, until they become holy.

But this will *prepare* them for pardon and acceptance: and will thus enable them to *hope for salvation.* When they have repented of sin, they have condemned it, and themselves on account of it: they have thus submitted to

the *law*, and are reconciled to the *authority* of God. When they have believed in Christ, with all the heart, they have *submitted* to him, and to the terms of salvation, through his atonement. They are then united to him, and have embraced him, as their Saviour. Indeed, they are then reconciled to God, and are *interested* in the atonement of Christ. Their *hearts* are then right with God. And thus, they are *prepared to find acceptance* with Him. He can then, *consistently* pardon and accept them. He can then do this, on the very principles and terms, on which they are *willing* to be accepted, and on which, he has *offered* them pardon and acceptance. Hence, on this ground, they can entertain the solid *hope* of salvation. They may then embrace the *promises* of God, to pardon and save them that obey the gospel; and with humble confidence, apply these to themselves. For they are then the very persons, to whom these promises are made. They may, therefore hope that God will keep *them* by his power, through faith unto salvation. For in the

Second place, They are then prepared for the *happiness* of heaven. While impenitent, sinners, even under the most pungent conviction, are wholly unprepared for the happiness of heaven: indeed, wholly unprepared for happiness in any part of the universe, where God is sensibly present. They are utterly unholy; utterly opposed to God, to his law and gospel, and to every thing, which constitutes the happiness of heaven. Hence, it is indispensably *necessary*, in order to obtain happiness, or the solid *hope* of happiness, in heaven, that they should be *holy*, in all manner of conversation. But, when they have become holy, they *are* prepared for the happiness of heaven: that is, *so far* as they are holy. Then, they have not only repented of sin and believed in Christ, but are *obedient* to the law and the gospel. They then *delight* in the presence of God and the Saviour; in his service; in his cause and people; and in all that pertains to the kingdom of heaven. Their very *desire and object* then are, to be what he requires, and to do what he commands. They will desire and labor to be perfectly conformed to his image, and to promote his glory; to be free from sin, and to glorify him in all things. And thus, when they contemplate his promises, and are led to understand their stability, and application; when they see that these apply to *all* them that become holy, and engage to keep them through faith unto salvation, they will be able to apply them to themselves, and to embrace a hope of salvation *sure and stedfast:* a hope, which will give them joy and peace in believing; and make them happy in the sure and animating confidence of future blessedness. For here God himself assures them, that in due time he will give them all their heart's desire; even to make them perfect in his image, and to admit them to dwell in his presence for ever. —These are some of the reasons *why* holiness will give men a *good* hope of salvation. They are *sufficient* to impart a hope, which maketh not ashamed.

I come more directly to the question already proposed, and to illustrate several things connected with it. These will command attention, under the following *Remarks.*

1st. We learn how *anxious sin-*

ners, who yet have no religion, can obtain a good hope of salvation. *They* are deeply interested in this subject. In all their attention to religion, their great *object* is, to obtain this hope.

Now, the way and the only way to obtain it is, to become holy, in all manner of conversation. Hence, instead of attempting to make their hearts any better, or their characters any more acceptable to God, *before* they begin to repent, they must repent of sin *immediately*. This is the way for *them* to make a new heart. They will not succeed in any other way. They never will make their hearts any better, till they do repent. This is obeying the first command of God, which applies to them. And then, instead of going about to establish their own righteousness, they must immediately believe in Christ with all the heart. They must embrace his atonement, and thus make him the end of the law for righteousness. This alone will avail for them. Their own righteousness, (even should it be perfect,) is utterly insufficient, as the *ground* of their justification. It cannot atone for one sin. A new heart, in this respect, is to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, whom God has revealed, and in whom he has *commanded* men to believe; and to trust in him alone for salvation. And having done this, instead of performing a round of external duties, merely to quiet a troubled conscience, or allay the fears of hell, they must cheerfully obey *all the commandments of God*, and submit to his holy Providence. They must, therefore, make it their great *object* to become holy; that is, to be and do in all things what God requires. They must do this *immediately*. There is no room for a moment's delay. For, until they do this, they never will obtain a *good* hope of salvation; they never will be prepared nor qualified for the approbation of God, nor for the happiness of heaven. Until they become holy, there is no promise, no Saviour, and in fact, no heaven, for them. The promises are all made to those who become *holy*. Christ came to save them not *in*, but *from*, their sins. Instead of approving, he utterly abhors them, while they remain unholy. And heaven itself is a place of perfect holiness. No unholy nor unclean thing will ever be allowed to enter there. Or, if unholy beings were *admitted*, they could not be happy there: they could take no part in the enjoyments or employments of that blessed region.—Hence, anxious sinners, who have no religion, and indeed *all* impenitent sinners, if they would obtain a good hope of salvation, *must become holy*. And when they have become holy, according to the definition already given of holiness, they will be *able* to obtain a hope of salvation "sure and stedfast:" even that, "which maketh not ashamed." For then, they will be prepared for divine approbation; qualified for the happiness of heaven; and interested in those precious promises, which ensure salvation to all penitent believers. The subject will also enable us to illustrate several things, *connected* with the inquiry under consideration. For we learn,

2dly. That while anxious sinners are striving to obtain *merely a hope* of salvation, or of *escaping future misery*, they *never* will obtain a good hope.

The case is, they are striving to obtain happiness, or the hope of it, *without holiness*. They are

laboring to quiet a troubled conscience, and to obtain the hope of final acceptance, by their own works, and not through the atonement of Christ. And yet they seem to think they are striving to obtain true religion. Here lies their deception; a deception, which, if not detected and abandoned, will effect their ruin. For they are not even *seeking* to become holy: they are not *repenting* of sin itself: they are not *embracing* the Lord Jesus Christ, nor *submitting* to him as their Saviour: nor are they truly obedient to the commands of God, nor submissive to his holy Providence. To be free from sin; to be united to Christ, and subject to him, in his Mediatorial offices; and thus to glorify God in all things, is not their object. All they are seeking to obtain, while they continue unholy, is, the prospect, and, if possible, the assurance of *salvation*, or of escaping *future misery*. Their inquiry is, how shall I be *saved?* How shall I obtain *future happiness?* It is a question, relating solely to themselves: it is mere selfishness: having no regard to the glory of God: no intention to promote his glory: and thus no desire to be really holy.

But, the truth is, so long as this is their only object, they never will obtain a *good* hope of salvation. The thing is not possible. For they cannot enjoy the happiness of heaven, nor the sensible presence of God, while they remain unholy. And there is no holiness whatever, in seeking to obtain *merely* a hope of salvation, or of escaping future misery. Neither the motive nor the object is holy. The sole object is, to escape future misery. And all their exertions are made for this ultimate end. Make them believe, that they can obtain their object, by pursuing a course utterly sinful; persuade them, that a course of open disobedience is the most direct and sure way to escape misery, or to quiet their consciences and their fears of hell, and they are prepared to follow it. The only reason why they attend to the duties of *religion* is, they feel the *necessity* of doing this: they are convinced that this is the only way to escape divine wrath, or obtain the *hope* of salvation. It is, therefore, *evident*, that there is no holiness in seeking to obtain *merely* a hope of salvation. And it is no less evident, that, while this is their object, they never can obtain a *good* hope. There is no foundation for it: they are not *qualified* for heaven: they cannot be *happy* there: indeed, by all this, they are made no better. Nothing but holiness will qualify them for heaven: and thus, nothing but this can give them a good *hope of obtaining its happiness*. Hence,

3dly. We learn why so many anxious sinners *fail* of obtaining a good hope; or why they seem to labor in vain, and after a few efforts, sink down again into their former stupidity. They seek what it is not possible for them to obtain: viz. happiness, or the sure hope of it, *without holiness*. They look entirely at the *fearful consequences* of sin. They manifest no fear of sin itself, as being odious in the sight of God. And hence, instead of genuine repentance, or of any thing that aims at the glory of God, and evinces *opposition* to sin, they exert themselves, merely to escape its punishment, or obtain the *prospect* of escaping it. Here they often appear in earnest. When they are very anxious, or under *deep* conviction, they seem ready to do almost any thing and every thing,

to escape divine wrath, or to obtain the hope of salvation; that is, almost any thing, but to become holy.

But God will not *regard* such exertions. He *cannot* regard them with approbation. He *cannot* impart a good hope of salvation to *such* persons. They are not prepared for it. They do not even *seek* that, in which a preparation for heaven actually consists. And because God does not regard *these* unholy exertions, and does not give them the hope they are seeking, and the relief they are expecting, though they remain utterly unholy, they soon give up their exertions: they say it does no good for them to seek any longer: they begin to say, they *cannot* be saved: there is no mercy for them: they have done all they *can* do: and it is useless to make any further exertions. This is the true reason, why anxious sinners so often fail of obtaining a good hope of salvation. Alas! they show the pride and obstinacy of their hearts. For they disregard the command of God before us, "Be ye *holy*, in all manner of conversation." And thus, they neglect to perform the things, *implied* in real holiness. The truth is, it *is* useless to strive in this manner: there *is* no mercy for them, they *cannot* be saved, in their utter unholiness. If they mean to escape the wrath of God, and the *just* punishment of their sins, they must take a *new course*, and seek a *new object*. They must obey the command of God, and thus do the things implied in it. Did they feel this, and had they a willing mind, they might obey his command as easily as they can now perform their unholy services. Let them once *do* this: let them *strive* to be holy in all manner of conversation; let it be their object to *repent*, and *believe*, and *obey God;* let it be their heart's desire and prayer to be *like God*, to be reconciled to him, and to enjoy him, on earth and in heaven,—and these very persons will be able to obtain a good hope of salvation. Such a hope will in due time follow of course: it will then crown their efforts. For then, God and their consciences will approve them. With *such* hearts, and under the influence of *such* motives, they will be able to lay hold of the *promises* of God, and apply them to themselves. Their hope itself will then be, not only that they shall escape future misery, but also that they shall be *free from sin;* that they shall be *like* God, and be admitted to dwell for ever *with* him. This good hope will rest upon his promises, and thus be "sure and stedfast."

We learn, Finally, that God will be just, and *appear* just, in the damnation of impenitent sinners.—That they will be doomed to *suffer* eternal punishment, is as certain from his testimony, as that the righteous will inherit eternal life. And from what has been said, we learn the *justice* of it. For God has not only commanded them to seek salvation, and promised eternal life to all who obey him, but has taught them *how* they must seek, and *what* they must do, to obtain it. He has said, "Be ye *holy* in all manner of conversation." He has also taught what holiness is, or what sinners must *do*, to be holy in all manner of conversation. He has made all this so plain, that way-faring men, though fools, shall not err therein. Hence, he will be just, and will *appear* just, in the damnation of those who remain unholy. For it will

then appear, that where the gospel comes, they had an opportunity to *know* all these things. It is, therefore, of prime importance, that all impenitent sinners should *regard* this truth; that the thoughtless should regard it; that *anxious* sinners should regard it; yea, that hypocrites should regard it. For the eternal ruin of such sinners will be dreadful. It will appear just to *them*. They will be *without excuse*. And yet, if they do not become holy, this will be their dreadful portion. Wherefore, O sinner, as he who now calls you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation. This is the way, and the *only* way, to obtain a good hope of salvation. It is a safe and sure way. For it is written, "Godliness is profitable unto all things, having *promise* of the life that now is, and of that which is to come."

J. A. G.

TRUE COURAGE.

"FINALLY, be courageous. Dare to be honest, just, magnanimous, true to your God, to your country, to yourselves, and to the world. Dare to do to others as you would have them do to you. Most men are cowards. They are afraid to speak and to act, when duty calls, and as duty requires. I recommend courage as a great and a rare virtue.—Few men will suffer themselves to be called cowards; and yet they betray their cowardice by the very course they take to avenge the insult. A man may intrepidly face the cannon's mouth, and be an arrant coward after all. There is a higher, a nobler courage, than was ever displayed in the heat of battle, or on the field of carnage.

"There is a moral courage, which enables a man to triumph over foes more formidable than were ever marshalled by any Cæsar. A courage which impels him to do his duty—to hold fast his integrity—to maintain a conscience void of offence toward God and toward men, at every hazard and sacrifice—in defiance of the world, and of the prince of the world. Such was the courage of Moses, of Joseph, of Daniel, of Aristides, of Phocion, of Regulus, of Paul, of Luther, of Washington. Such is the courage which sustains every good man, amidst the temptations, allurements, honors, conflicts, opposition, ridicule, malice, cruelty, persecution, which beset and threaten him at every stage of his progress through life. It is not a noisy, obtrusive, blustering, boastful courage, which pushes itself into notice when there is no real danger, but which shrinks away when the enemy is at the door. It is calm, self possessed, meek, gentle, peaceful, unostentatious, modest, retiring; but when the fearful hour arrives, then you shall behold the majesty of genuine Christian courage, in all her native energy and grandeur, breathing the spirit of angelic purity, and grasping victory from the fiery furnace or the lion's den; when not one of all the millions of this world's heroes would have ventured to share her fortune."—*Lindsley's Address.*

EFFECT OF LOTTERIES.

THE 10th November, 1825, the Sieur Jean Baptiste Mayousse, 37 years of age, formerly a manufacturer of silk goods, at Lyons, (France,) hung himself in his chamber. A letter, found on his

bureau, announced that the misfortunes which overwhelmed him a long time since, forced him to this act of despair, and that he could not accuse any person with being the cause of his death. It has been discovered with certainty, that his misfortunes arose from an ungovernable passion for the lottery, where he sacrificed all his resources.

Let this late example of the consequences of a passion for play prevent those who read it from seeking their fortune by these base means! A rapid gain is seldom the product of honest industry, and those only who labor, deserve the bread which they have earned. Avoid play. Fly from the lottery!

Labor only is the honorable way of gaining riches, and it is incomparably the surest!

"THE BIBLE THERE."

THE Rev. Mr. W. now a missionary at the Sandwich Islands, a short time before he left this country, took passage from New-York to New-Haven in a packet. In the evening a company of fellow passengers, who were quite profane, gathered round a table, on which was the only light burning in the cabin, and soon became deeply engaged in gambling. Mr. W. after reflecting some time on the best means of reproving them, drew a bible from his trunk, and politely requested that he might have a seat at the same table for the purpose of reading. The sight of the Bible at once stopped their swearing; and after gambling in total silence about ten minutes, they all left the table and went upon deck: thus evincing that the *silent reproofs* of a good man, with the Bible in his hand, are too loud and too pointed for a guilty conscience to endure.—*N. H. Repos. & Ob.*

SCOFFER CONFOUNDED.

A GENTLEMAN in a stage coach attempted to divert the company, and display his hostility to the Scriptures, by throwing them into ridicule: "As to the *prophecies*," said he, "in particular, they were all written after the events took place." A minister in the coach who had previously been silent, replied, "Sir, I must beg leave to mention one remarkable prophecy as an exception. 'Knowing this *first;* that there shall come in the latter days *scoffers*.' Now, sir, whether the event be long before the prediction, I leave the company to judge." The mouth of the scorner was stopped.

APHORISMS.

LYSIMACHUS, for extreme thirst, offered his kingdom to the Getæ, to quench it. His exclamation after drinking was, "Ah! wretched me, who, for such a momentary gratification, have lost so great a kingdom!" How applicable this to the case of him, who, for the momentary pleasure of sin, parts with the kingdom of heaven!

Heaven will pay for the loss of any thing that we can lose to get it, or for any labor we can bestow for it. But nothing can pay for the loss of heaven.

The promises of God, like a well drawn picture, look on all, who, with an eye of faith, look on them. They also, like the beams of the sun, enter the poor man's cottage as freely as they do the king's palace.

Religious Intelligence.

From the Missionary Herald.

THE annual Reports of the Protestant Bible Society of Paris, the Society for Evangelical Missions among nations not Christian, and the Religious Tract Society, have been received at the Missionary Rooms. These Reports were presented in April 1826, and give a detailed account of the state and proceedings of these Societies during the preceding year.

It cannot but cause great joy to those who feel the value of religion to themselves, and especially to those, who are engaged in advancing the Redeemer's kingdom, to see how the truths of the Bible operate on men of a different nation and language; producing the same mutual love among all those who bear the image of the Saviour, the same commiseration for the sufferings of men, the same desire for their salvation, and the same combined and strenuous efforts to promote it. It is interesting, too, to see that those in different parts of the world, who are aiming to promote the present and future welfare of man, resort to the same means,—the dissemination of Divine Truth; and that they are adopting the same methods, combining their efforts, giving all who are disposed opportunity to co-operate, and thus encouraging each other in their arduous, yet delightful labors.

The Bible Society.

The Protestant Bible Society of Paris, met in that city on the 12th of April. The Marquis of Jaucourt, a peer of France, presided, and previous to the reading of the Report, addressed the Society in a speech exhibiting great devotedness to the Society, and enlarged views of its object, and the tendency of its efforts. Some parts of this speech show, that the spirit of toleration, and a desire to diffuse knowledge, especially religious knowledge, through all classes of the community, is prevailing even among the nobility. The following paragraphs taken from this speech, exhibit the views of the President.

"Those only who are ignorant, forbid the study of the Bible, and those only who have not learned to look at it in the proper light, can mistake its benefits.

"Those who oppose the distribution of the Bible, aim to render it useless to those numerous classes of men, who, ever since its translation into the language of the people, have derived from it the most precious treasures of light and truth. Their object in making this opposition is, to retain in their own hands the right of interpreting it,—a claim, against which, every real Christian ought most loudly to protest. Let us never fear, therefore, that in promoting the objects of this Society, we shall suffer ourselves to be carried away by a religious zeal, which my conduct us into a perilous path."

After remarking on the peculiar importance of putting the Bible into the hands of the young, of giving it circulation in all the elementary and Sunday Schools, and enforcing this by the example of Protestants of preceding generations, who labored to make the faith of their children the result of deep and firm conviction, he says,—

"When regarded in this light, the work of circulating the Bible, cannot but be ranked among the most important services, which we can render to our king and country."

The Report was read by Baron Pelet, one of the Secretaries. From the Report, it appears that 5,375 Bibles, and 6,106 New-Testaments, were issued from the Society's Depositories, during the preceding year. The whole number of Bibles and Testaments, which this Society has distributed, during the seven years of its existence, is 61,414. The receipts of the year were 63,301 francs, and the expenses of the same period 57,877 francs. The funds of the Society are increasing, as is the number of those who take an interest in its progress. It has about forty auxiliaries in the different departments of France; and small associations and committees in almost every Protestant parish. The Female Auxiliary of Paris, raised 6,959 francs; and the Auxiliary, composed of Protestant mechanics and laborers, raised 1,344 francs. It is stated, that, since

the Bible has been circulated in the capital, the number of scholars in the schools has greatly increased, that new schools have been formed, and that the assemblies for public worship on the Sabbath are vastly more numerous. The Protestant families in France, to which the Bible needs to be furnished, are estimated at 300,000.

The Tract Society.

The Religious Tract Society held its annual meeting on the 11th of April: 450,000 Tracts have been circulated by this Society, during the four years of its existence. During the last year, it put into circulation 127,386. Its receipts amounted to 5,259 francs, nearly double the amount of the preceding year. Its expenditures were 7,635 francs.

Its series embraces twenty-seven Tracts. It has also republished the Memoir of Keopuolani, written by the Missionaries at the Sandwich Islands, and first published in this country. The Society has also published a Christian Almanac, entitled "Almanac of Good Counsels," designed to be a vehicle of religious truth. To each day of the year, there is attached, in the calender, a reference to some appropriate passage of Scripture, which, it is designed, parents shall, on that day, teach to their children. Many, in various parts of France, are assiduous in forming Auxiliaries to this Society, and in distributing its publication.

"The pious youth of the town of Guillonville,—says the Report of the Society,—go out on the Sabbath to the neighboring villages, assemble the Protestant families which are scattered through them, and after having prayed and sung praises with them, they distribute Tracts.

"Rev. Mark Wilks, while addressing the Society, laid on the table five sous, the avails of a basket of fruit sold by some poor children, who had been so affected by reading one of the Society's Tracts, that they desired to offer these, as the only return which their poverty permitted them to make. A lady, he added, who listened to this story of the poor children, covered each of the five sous with a twenty franc piece. In these two facts he saw that the rich and the poor took equal interest in the labors of the Society."

Ordinations and Installations.

Ordained in Conway, Rev. DANIEL CROSBY, over the Congregational Society.

Dec. 20,—Rev. HUGH M. KOONTZ was ordained to the pastoral office and installed in the Presbyterian Congregation of "Hopewell," Orange county, N. Y. Sermon by Rev. R. W. Condit.

Jan. 10,—Rev. JEREMIAH GLINES, as Pastor of the Church in Lunenburg, Vt.

Jan. 10,—Rev. JARED B. WATERBURY was installed as colleague Pastor with Rev. Dr. Lyman, in the Church at Hatfield, Ms. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Sprague, of West Springfield.

Jan. 17,—Rev. JOSEPH HARVEY, was ordained as Pastor of the Congregational Church in Colchester, West Chester Society, Conn. Sermon by Rev. Joseph Vail, of Hadlyme.

Jan. 24,—Rev. CYRUS P. GROSVENOR was installed over the First Baptist Church in Boston. Sermon by Rev Mr. Wayland, President elect of Brown University.

Jan. 24,—Rev. ELIAS W. KELLOGG, was ordained as Pastor of the Congregational Church and Society in Albany, Vt. Sermon by Rev. E. J. Boardman, of Danville.

By the Rutland, Vt. Association, Rev. EZRA D. KINNE, as an Evangelist. Sermon by Rev. B. Green, of Brandon.

Feb. 7,—Rev. SILAS HALL, was installed as Pastor of the Second Baptist Church, in Taunton, Mass. Sermon by the Rev. Stephen Gano, of Providence.

Feb. 14,—Rev. JOHN P. CLEAVELAND, was ordained as Pastor of the Tabernacle Church and Society in Salem. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Sprague, of West Springfield.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—FIDELIS and F. are received.

THE

CHRISTIAN MAGAZINE.

VOL. IV. APRIL, 1827. No. 4.

For the Christian Magazine.

THE FORBEARANCE OF GOD TOWARD THE WICKED.

It is a truth, established both by Scripture and observation, that God often treats the wicked with kindness and forbearance in the present world. According to the Scriptures, he is good to all, and his tender mercies are over all his works. He causes his sun to shine upon the evil and the good, and sends his rain upon the just and upon the unjust. Sentence against an evil work is not speedily executed by him. He is often rich in goodness, forbearance, and long suffering toward sinners. Job, speaking concerning the wicked, says, they "become old, yea, are mighty in power. Their houses are safe from fear, neither is the rod of God upon them. They spend their days in wealth. The tabernacles of robbers prosper, and they that provoke God, are secure; into whose hand God bringeth abundantly. The earth is given into the hand of the wicked." And the Psalmist affirms respecting the wicked,—"They are not in trouble, as other men; neither are they plagued like other men. Their eyes stand out with fatness; they have more than heart could wish. Behold, these are the ungodly, who prosper in the world; they increase in riches." In accordance with these declarations of Scripture, are the results of personal observation. How frequently have we seen wicked men,—those, perhaps, who denied the existence of God, and despised his word—who, at best appeared, neither to fear him nor keep his commandments,—treated by him with great kindness and forbearance. We have seen their store-houses and barns filled with the products of the earth,—their coffers replenished with silver and gold,—their brows encircled with the laurels of worldly honour,—and their lives prolonged to old age. The kindness and forbearance of God toward the wicked must appear to be, indeed great, if it is considered, that they deserve nothing but evil at his hand. Strict retributive justice would allow him to cut them immediately down, and banish them from his favourable presence into regions of endless darkness and despair. It is of his mercy, that they are not consumed; because his compassions fail not.

On account of God's kindness and forbearance toward the wicked, some have doubted, whether he hates sin and is determined to punish the transgressor.

This has been done by the wicked themselves. The ungodly in the time of the Psalmist, who increased in riches and prospered in the world, said,—"How doth God know? and is there knowledge in the Most High?" The royal preacher affirms, that

"because sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily, therefore, the heart of the sons of men is fully set in them to do evil." The wicked, in the time of Isaiah, said by way of derision,—"Let him make speed, and hasten his work, that we may see it; and let the counsel of the Holy One of Israel draw nigh and come, that we may know it!" In the time of Jeremiah, they belied the Lord, and said, "It is not he; neither shall evil come upon us; neither shall we see sword nor famine. Where is the word of the Lord? let it come now." In the time of Ezekiel, they were accustomed to say,—"The days are prolonged, and every vision faileth." In the time of Malachi, they said, "Every one that doeth evil, is good in the sight of the Lord, and he delighteth in them;" and inquired,—"Where is the God of judgment?" And Peter affirms that, "there shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts, and saying, Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue, as they were from the beginning of the creation." Nor is there any reason to doubt, that wicked men often reason in a similar manner at the present time. Because an almost uninterrupted tide of earthly prosperity has been hitherto flowing in upon them, they frequently imagine themselves peculiar favourites of heaven, and flatter themselves, that they shall never see evil, though they continue to walk in the sight of their own eyes, and after the imagination of their own hearts.

Nor has any thing, perhaps, more perplexed and disturbed good men, than the kindness and forbearance of God toward the wicked;—the little apparent distinction, which he often makes between them who serve him, and them who serve him not. We have an example of this in the Scriptures. And, it is believed, that many good men at the present day occasionally find perplexities and temptations arising in their minds on the account of the lenity of God toward the wicked. The kindness and forbearance of God toward the wicked does not, however, furnish us with any just reason for doubting, whether he hates sin and is determined to punish the transgressor. This, it is believed, will be rendered fully evident by a careful attention to the following considerations.

1. The prosperously wicked are not in reality so happy, as their appearance often leads us to suppose. No truth is rendered more evident, either by the word of God or personal experience, than the truth, that real happiness depends incomparably less on external prosperity, than on the internal feelings of the soul. That a man may be truly happy, he must have a reconciled heart, a peaceful conscience, and a contented mind. Whatever else he may have, if he possesses not these, he cannot but be miserable. Here is a man, whose treasury, containing the precious coins, is inexhaustible. He is elevated to the chair of state, and his ears are daily saluted with the accents of worldly applause. How common it is for us to pronounce such a man preeminently happy. But, if we would know whether he is truly happy, or otherwise, we must know what is passing in his mind. We must become acquainted with the hidden affections of his heart. We must follow him to

his place of retirement, and behold what feelings are agitating his breast, when there secluded from the world. Could we thus enter into the secret chambers of his soul, we should, perhaps, find them the abode of envy, and resentment, and remorse, and discontent, and fear, and other passions, that are altogether at variance with true happiness. This is, either in a greater or less degree, most certainly true with respect to him, if he is what he is here supposed to be—a wicked man. Denying, as he perhaps does, the very existence of God, and daily transgressing his commands; gratifying his desires without regard to the feelings of others; corrupting those around him by his example; or, by his ambition, diffusing desolation and misery over the face of society; he must necesarily be a stranger to that peace, contentment and consolation of mind, which are essential ingredients in the article of human happiness. Consciousness of the sinfulness of his course; occasional remorse of conscience, howmuch soever he may endeavour to stifle its remonstrances; fear of that Being whose existence he affects to deny; dread of death, and of that future punishment, the idea of which he affects to despise; must all concur in embittering his earthly enjoyments, and rendering him wretched. These remarks are sanctioned by many examples and explicit declarations contained in the word of God.

To mention one example, that of Haman, after having told "his friends of the glory of his riches, and the multitude of his children, and all the things wherein the king had promoted him," and the queen had honoured him, he added,—"All this availeth me nothing, so long as I see Mordecai the Jew sitting at the king's gate." This example demonstrably proves, that a wicked man, though seated on the pinnacle of worldly prosperity, may, notwithstanding, be unspeakably wretched. Accordingly it is written,—"Then were they in great fear, where no fear was. The wicked flee, when no man pursueth. The wicked man travaileth with pain all his days. A dreadful sound is in his ears. Trouble and anguish shall come upon him. The wicked are like the troubled sea, when it cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt. There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked." Thus it appears, that the prosperously wicked are not, in reality, so happy, as their appearance often leads us to suppose.

2. A delay on the part of God to inflict merited punishment upon the wicked, appears very different to him from what the same delay appears to men. Twenty, fifty, seventy, or a hundred years have often appeared to his imperfect friends a long period for him to exercise forbearance toward persons deserving his indignation and wrath. And, to his enemies, his delays to execute vengeance upon them have appeared to be of so long continuance, that they have been thereby encouraged, with atheistical boldness and impiety, to inquire, "Where is the promise of his coming?" But how differently do such delays appear to God! The Scriptures declare, that "one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day;—that a thousand years in his sight are but as yesterday, when it is past,

and as a watch in the night." According to this representation of the subject, his forbearing, for a thousand years, to come out in judgment against his enemies, appears no more to him, than his forbearing to do this for a single day, appears to us. Surely, then, his forbearance toward them does not warrant us to doubt, whether he hates sin, and is determined to punish transgressors.

3. God sometimes delays to execute punishment upon his enemies, for the purpose of trying and proving the faith and patience of his friends. We have already seen, what an occasion of perplexity and temptation his kindness and forbearance toward the wicked were to Jeremiah. "Wherefore doth the way of the wicked prosper? Wherefore are all they happy, that deal very treacherously?" Yet his confidence in God was not destroyed; for he, notwithstanding, said,—"Righteous art thou, O Lord,"—and thus ascribed perfect moral rectitude to his Maker. We have also seen, what an occasion of perplexity and temptation God's kindness and forbearance to the wicked were to the Psalmist. On account of the prosperity of the wicked, he was tempted to say, he had cleansed his heart in vain, and had in vain washed his hands in innocency. Yet, his faith, though shaken for a season, did not entirely fail, but was, in the event, strengthened and confirmed.

4. God sometimes delays to execute punishment on the wicked, that he may use them as instruments in his hand of chastising sinful individuals, churches, and nations. Addressing an ancient, idolatrous king of Assyria, he said,—"O Assyrian, the rod of mine anger, and the staff in their hand is mine indignation. I will send him against an hypocritical nation, and against the people of my wrath will I give him a charge, to take the spoil, and to take the prey, and to tread them down like mire in the streets. Howbeit, he meaneth not so, neither doth his heart think so; but it is in his heart to destroy and cut off nations not a few. Wherefore, it shall come to pass, that, when the Lord hath performed his whole work upon Mount Zion and upon Jerusalem, I will punish the fruit of the stout heart, of the king of Assyria, and the glory of his high looks."

Addressing, as is suppsed, a wicked king of Babylon, God denominated him his battle axe, and his weapons of war; and then proceeded to say, that, with him, he would break in pieces and destroy nations, and kingdoms, and horses, and riders, and chariots, and men, and women, and the young, and the old, and the shepherd and his flock, and the husbandman and his yoke of oxen, and captains, and rulers. From this remarkable language it clearly appears, that God sometimes forbears to execute punishment upon wicked men, that he may use them as instruments in his own hands in chastising sinful individuals, churches and nations. He delays, for a season, to execute merited punishment upon the Alexanders, the Cæsars, the Neros, the Herods, and the Bonapartes of the world, that he may use them as his battle axes, and as the rods of his anger, —though they mean not so, neither think so in their hearts, but have it in their hearts to destroy and cut off nations not a few.

5. God forbears to execute merited punishment upon the wicked, that he may set before us an example of moderation and forbearance. We are commanded to be slow to anger, to forbear threatening, to resist not evil, and to let our moderation be known to all men. And to influence us to exercise that temper of mind, which such precepts enjoin, the example of the merciful forbearance of God toward his enemies, is distinctly held up to our view. "Love your enemies,—and your reward shall be great, and ye shall be called the children of the Highest, for he is kind unto the unthankful and the evil. *Be ye, therefore, merciful, as your Father also is merciful.*" What consideration could be better suited, than the one here stated, to engage us to be merciful to those, by whom we have been deeply injured? The design and tendency of the merciful forbearance of God toward the wicked, to lead us to the exercise of moderation and forbearance toward our fellow-creatures, were beautifully noticed by a celebrated heathen moralist and historian. "God," says he, "is sometimes slow in punishing the wicked, in order to teach us mortals a lesson of moderation."

6. God is sometimes influenced to delay the execution of merited punishment upon the wicked, by compassion to those with whom they may be intimately connected. This idea is evidently implied in the parable concerning the wheat and the tares. In explaining that parable to his disciples, our Saviour said,—"The good seed are the children of the kingdom, but the tares are the children of the wicked one." And he represents the householder as saying to his servants, who had inquired whether they should go and gather up the tares,—"Nay, lest, when ye gather up the tares ye root up the wheat also with them." This language clearly implies, that the righteous and the wicked are frequently so connected and intermingled in this world, that it would be difficult, if not impossible, for God to inflict merited punishment upon the latter, without involving the former in the same sufferings; and, hence, that he sometimes delays to come out in judgment against his enemies, by compassion to his friends. In a community of people generally notorious for their atheism, infidelity, extortion, injustice, oppression, murder, and many other heaven-daring crimes, there may be a few real friends of God, who, if he were, by fire, or tempest, or pestilence, or earthquake, to come out in judgment against the multitudes of the wicked, with whom they are connected, would themselves be inevitably involved in the general ruin. In compassion to them he, therefore, forbears to execute his wrath upon the multitudes of his enemies, with whom they are connected. God, therefore, spares sinners, in compassion to them.

7. God exercises forbearance toward the wicked, that they may have an opportunity to repent and be saved. "The Lord," says Peter, "is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness, but is long-suffering to us ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." God has no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but rather desires that they may return and live. It appears to him desirable,

in itself considered, that none should perish, but that all should come to repentance and be saved. He has made abundant provision for the salvation of all; and, by many gracious invitations and promises, he is calling upon them to come to the fountain of living waters, and partake of them without money and without price. And, he is long suffering toward sinners, that they may have space for repentance and for coming to the knowledge of the truth. Had God never been accustomed to exercise forbearance toward distinguished transgressors, how many such persons, who eventually became eminent for piety and usefulness, would have been cut down in their sins, and have perished forever. Take, for example, the Apostle Paul. Before his conversion, he was a most violent persecutor of the church. He breathed out threatenings and slaughter against the followers of Christ. Giving an account of this matter before king Agrippa, he himself said,—"Many of the saints did I shut up in prison; and, when they were put to death, I gave my voice against them. And I punished them oft in every synagogue, and compelled them to blaspheme, and, being exceedingly mad against them, I persecuted them even unto strange cities." How offensive must his conduct have been to God! What provocation did he give his Maker to cut him off in his sins! But, had this been then done, his own soul must have been lost, and all that good, which he afterwards did, would have been prevented. Estimate then, the worth of his own soul, and of all those souls, which he was instrumental in converting to the Christian faith, and then say, whether God has not good reasons for his forbearance toward the wicked.

8. Though God often does, and for the reasons that have been stated, exercise forbearance toward the wicked; yet, he sometimes does, even in the present world, punish them for their transgressions. Examples of this, too numerous to be here particularly mentioned, must readily suggest themselves to the mind of the reader. On the murderous Cain, God fixed an indelible mark of disgrace, and caused him to wander a vagabond upon the face of the earth. For an hundred and twenty years, he exercised forbearance toward the inhabitants of the antediluvian world. But he at length, opened the windows of heaven,—broke up the fountains of the great deep, and swept them from time into eternity by an universal deluge. For their cruel treatment of his chosen people, he overwhelmed Pharaoh and his hosts, and destroyed them, in the Red Sea. He destroyed the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah, for their enormous deeds, by fire and brimstone from heaven. For their unbelief, their rejection and crucifixion of the Messiah, he came out in judgment against the Jews, and dispersed them among all the nations of the earth. And, in every age of the world, he has, notwithstanding all his forbearance toward the wicked, most manifestly and repeatedly visited them with natural evil on account of their transgressions.

Numerous and important, however, as are the reasons of his forbearance toward sinners; and often as he does here punish them for their transgressions; we should be unable fully and satisfactorily to account for his kindness and forbearance toward

them, without directing forward our views to a state of future and eternal retribution. It may, therefore, be remarked,

9. That God will treat the wicked according to their character and desert at the day of judgment. Of such a day the Bible repeatedly and explicitly speaks. And to that day it directs us to look forward as the period, when all the apparent irregularities in the Divine administration, which are here witnessed, will be completely rectified, and all the concerns of the universe will, with the most consummate wisdom, be adjusted for eternity. It will be "a day of the revelation of the righteous judgment of God." The Lord will then execute judgment upon all, and convince all the ungodly of their ungodly deeds, which they will have ungodly committed, and ungodly sinners of all their hard speeches, which they will have spoken against him. The Judge, being seated on the throne of his glory, will assemble all nations before him, and will separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats; —and, having placed the wicked on his left hand, he will banish them into everlasting fire prepared for the Devil and his angels. Look steadily forward to this "day of the revelation of the righteous judgment of God,"— this winding up of the grand and universal drama,—and from God's kindness and forbearance toward the wicked in the present world, you will never more be inclined to doubt, whether he hates sin and is disposed and determined to punish the impenitent transgressor. Understanding "their end," you will exclaim with the Psalmist,—"Surely, thou didst set them in slippery places; thou castedst them down into destruction."

F.

For the Christian Magazine.

MORE INQUIRIES RESPECTING SUBMISSION.

Messrs. Editors.—I have read, with some attention, the answer of Alius Juvenis to my inquiries respecting submission; and feel under obligation to him, for the pains he has taken to remove my difficulties, especially as his remarks appear to me, in general, candid and judicious. Not feeling, however, entirely satisfied, and believing that discussion is calculated to throw light on the subject, I beg permission to offer a few more inquiries.

I am not sure, that I might not, with some justice, complain a little of the answer, in one respect. It is asserted "that Juvenis, by the form and manner in which he has proposed his questions, has raised a great dust." Now however dangerous the tendency of those inquiries may be, one would suppose, that the man who should feel that he had *logic* enough to answer them fairly, would be slow to admit, that they were so powerful, as to require an appeal to popular prejudice to break their effect.

I regret to find, that the point of some of my first inquiries has been mistaken in the answer. The argument of S., which Senex undertook to answer, seemed to me substantially this. 'This submission, this willingness to be destroyed in a future state, must be the act either of an impenitent sinner, or of a Christian. If it is the act of an impenitent sinner, than it is worth nothing. In such

a man "there is no good thing." It must then, if God has required it, and it is essential to salvation, be the act of a new creature, a real Christian. But for a real Christian to be willing that God should destroy *him*, in a future state, would imply a willingness that God should violate his promise, "he that believeth shall be saved," and alter the actual constitution of his government.'

To avoid this argument, Senex replied, that the time *when* a Christian is bound to exercise this submission, is when "*he sees no evidence of being a subject of grace.*" That is, when he has no hope, when he is in a state of despair, ignorant of the fact that "old things have passed away and all things are become new." I could wish that Alius Juvenis had kept to this consistent statement of Senex, instead of substituting the phrase "doubting Christians," which, I think, is calculated to mislead your readers into the belief, that Senex would insist on it, that every one, who has not an absolute assurance of being a Christian, ought to be willing to be eternally miserable. This, I think, he has not said.

On reading the above sentiment, the thoughts which occurred to me were these.

Suppose some zealous Protestant should read this, who is in the habit of discarding with violence the old doctrine of the man of sin, that "ignorance is the mother of devotion." Would he not say, 'If ignorance is the mother of this submission, let us have nothing to do with it. God never required of us a blind duty, he never suspended our salvation on what we ought not to perform, and cannot, till we get into a dungeon, into despair. To suppose that this submission is essential to salvation, and that ignorance of ourselves, on an important point, is essential to this submission, would be to make ignorance the mother of salvation. A doctrine, which implies, that we owe to God an essential and saving duty, which we never could perform consistently, if we knew ourselves, is absurd in itself, and contrary to the whole tenor of the Bible.'

It occurred to me, also, that some steadfast Arminian, who had labored long to find some interpretation of the 9th chapter of Romans, consistent with his scheme of doctrines, and which would quiet his conscience in rejecting Calvinism, would congratulate himself—Remembering that the 3d verse of this chapter is brought to prove the doctrine of submission, as held by Senex, he would exclaim—'If St. Paul felt what he wrote in that verse, *when* he "saw no evidence that he was a subject of saving grace," who knows but what the rest of the chapter was written in the same state of mind, and the whole is to be viewed as the mere ravings of despair.'

Now I confess, Messrs Editors, that I saw no way to meet these objections, unless I could say that this ignorance is necessary. I am aware that the limits of human knowledge are circumscribed within a narrow circle. "God's ways are past finding out." This imposes on us certain duties. We are, in effect, forbidden to search into "secret things which belong unto the Lord our God," and not to us. The fact, that "clouds and darkness are round about him," calls on us to trust, to exercise confidence, that where we cannot see, every thing is as perfect as where we can. The

point of my inquiries was, whether the ignorance of a good man, that he is a subject of saving grace, is of this kind necessary, and therefore the basis of an exercise essential to salvation, against which no objection could lie? You will therefore not be surprised at the remark, that I am not wholly satisfied with the answer which has been given. Be it so, that an unrequired and unnecessary sinfulness is the basis of the command to repent; be it so, that an uncommanded sickness, or death, and a hundred other things, with which the commands of God have nothing to do, are the basis of certain appropriate duties; does it therefore follow that an unnecessary *ignorance* can be the proper and necessary basis of a duty essential to salvation? This point your correspondent seems to have dodged by, with great ingenuity, and as it appears to me, rather slyly.

But it is time that I proceed to offer the proposed inquiries. It seems to be tacitly conceded, by Alius Juvenis, that a willingness to be destroyed in a future state, would not be the duty of Christians, who have not "felt themselves destitute of evidence that they were subjects of grace since they were renewed." But, he says, "It proves nothing against the reality and importance of unconditional submission, in all those cases, in which Christians are in doubt." That is, as I understand it, are ignorant of their conversion. On this I would inquire,

What is the first duty of a man who is needlessly ignorant? Is it not to obtain light? Should you meet a Hindoo, hurrying to the Ganges, really feeling that he must bathe in its sacred flood or be lost; or should you visit a Roman Catholic on his dying bed, in great agony to obtain absolution from a Priest, and fully assured that he must obtain it or perish forever; would you not say to such a man, Sir, it is your ignorance that makes you feel as you do. Your first duty is to obtain light. Had you performed the first duty, you could not feel as you now do. And were I to meet a real Christian, who was ignorant of his conversion, and who should tell me, he is willing that God should destroy him in a future state; would it not be my duty, on the principle advocated by Senex, to say to him, Sir, it is your ignorance that makes you feel *so*. Your first duty is to obtain light. Had you performed your first duty, you could not feel, and ought not to feel, as you now do. Would not this be a more "skilful," and "faithful," as well as more kind-hearted and successful course for a minister to pursue with the feeble, and comfortless, and broken-hearted of Christ's flock, than to insist that they shall be willing that God should destroy them in a future state?

Alius Juvenis asks, "Can a person be reconciled to God without being reconciled to his *law?* And can a person be reconciled to the law of God without cordially approving of its *penalty?*" To this I would say with all my heart, *by no means.* But I would inquire, Are we bound to be any *more* willing to "accept the punishment of our iniquity," than God is to inflict it? And how far is God willing to inflict it? On any but the finally impenitent?

Your correspondent says, "It is believed that many have been willing to 'accept the punishment of their iniquity' without once *considering* that it is the

purpose of God, that all who are cast off shall remain impenitent." This may be true. Many men have had a great many feelings, and opinions, without considering but half the Bible. But I would inquire, Can God be pleased with an exercise which owes its existence to the want of consideration? Has he suspended our salvation on such an exercise?

He goes further, and allows that those who exercise the submission for which he contends, "do sometimes consider that all who are cast off will remain impenitent." And he endeavors to show that men ought to be *willing* to remain impenitent." His argument, in support of this strange sentiment, is briefly this; Sin, that is, impenitence until death, "may be viewed as the effect of a divine purpose—and a disposition to submit to the purposes of God is essential to salvation: therefore it is a duty to be willing to be impenitent. Now, Messrs. Editors, after premising that I fully believe, that "God has fore-ordained whatsoever comes to pass,"—I beg leave to inquire,

How any man that now lives, or ever will live, is to obtain this *view* of his own future impenitence as the effect of a divine purpose? How can he know that there is a purpose of God to this effect? Is it not manifestly impossible for him to know this, without a special revelation? And what right has he to suppose it? If this *view* is impossible, in the case of every individual, how can any man be accused of any want of "a disposition to submit to the purposes of God," by being totally unreconciled to impenitence, either present or future?

Once more. It is remarked, "The submission of which they (the advocates for unconditional submission) speak, is to *future*, not to *present* impenitence." On this I would inquire,

Whether present impenitence is not as much the effect of a divine purpose, as future? And if submission to God is inconsistent with submission to present impenitence, why not to that which is future?

I would further inquire,

Is there not an essential difference between the decrees of God, and their effects? Especially those decrees which relate to the existence of moral evil, and render its existence morally certain? Are not God's decrees eternal?—their effects arising in time? Are not God's decrees the result of his own agency, alone; and their effects, in the case under consideration, the result of the agency of creatures, and of sinners? Are not God's decrees the holy and benevolent acts of an infinite mind—and their effects the wicked acts of polluted worms? Because I am found to have a disposition to submit to the former, am I therefore to the latter? If I submit to the decrees of God, *as decrees*—that is, as being what they are, holy, benevolent, and wise, is not this enough? Will it be said that they are indissolubly connected with moral evil? And are not day and night indissolubly connected by the twilight? But does this prove that midnight and noon are not opposites? Must not moral objects, of opposite characters, be contemplated with opposite feelings? And since moral evil is infinitely opposite in its character to the decrees of God, must not the heart which submits to the latter, be totally opposed to the former? Even considered as the effect of a divine purpose, is it not our duty to feel unreconciled to sin?

Will not this follow from the principles of Alius Juvenis? He contends that submission is inconsistent with present disobedience, but not with submission to future disobedience. Now this future disobedience must come. To submit to disobedience, *never to be*, is the same as submission to nothing. Roll on the wheels of time, and this once future disobedience will become present. Up to that moment, and at that moment, and after it, the man will be bound to submit to God with all his heart. And is not this the same thing, as opposing the effect of a divine purpose with all his heart? Does not God forbid the effects of his own decrees?

But further,

Does the purpose of God in regard to sin constitute any thing more than the moral certainty of its existence? Is it not a certainty of the same kind, as that which we feel, when we know that a habitual drunkard will become intoxicated, if a sufficient quantity of spirits is thrown in his way? And is there any thing, in what God owes in this case, which *should* reconcile my heart to this in my own case or in the case of my child, or that of any man? Would my reconciliation of heart to a moral certainty of this kind, that I should murder my neighbor's child, be a greater act of submission, a more splendid virtue, than a reconciliation to the same kind of certainty that I should wantonly destroy his lamb?

Alius Juvenis says,—"It is not sufficiently considered, that submission always implies an *evil*, to be submitted to," and adds, this thought pursued will throw much light upon the subject now under consideration." This thought I cannot pursue, I am stumbled at the threshold. I know we are to "submit ourselves to God." But, with reverence, would inquire—

Is God an evil? Is his purpose an evil? Is his sovereignty? Is his Law? Is any thing an evil that is in God, or any thing he has ever done? When my heart submits to the justice of God in destroying all the finally impenitent, in a future state, must I say to God, I feel that this thy justice is an evil, but I submit to it? Or is it my duty, and my privilege, to feel that I submit to that which is holy, and righteous, and lovely —essential to the happiness of the universe, and the glory of its author? Is submission to God any thing more than one of the forms of love to God?

I shall *insist* on nothing, Messrs. Editors; but beg leave to inquire in conclusion,

Is not this notion of submission to *sin*, whether in ourselves, or our fellow creatures, whether in the form of impenitence, or imperfection, the grand consummation of all the Antinomianism of this world, from the beginning to the present time? JUVENIS.

From the Utica Christian Repository.

THE PILGRIM'S PROGRESS IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.—BY BUNYANUS.

CHAPTER XVI.

After Stephanus had finished his relation, the pilgrims retired to rest; and in the morning went on their way. Then I observed that their way was smooth and easy to their feet, and the air of the valley was refreshing and invigorating to their spirits. And as they went along, they sung:

"Father, I long, I faint to see
The place of thine abode:
I'd leave thine earthly courts, and flee
Up to thy seat, my God.

"There all the heavenly hosts are seen,
In shining ranks they move,
And drink immortal vigor in,
With wonder and with love.

"Then at thy feet with awful fear,
Th' adoring armies fall;
With joy they shrink to *nothing* there,
Before th' Eternal All.

"There I would vie with all the host
In duty and in bliss;
While *less than nothing* I would boast,
And vanity confess.

"The more thy glories strike mine eyes,
The humbler I shall lie:
Thus, while I sink, my joys shall rise
Unmeasurably high."

Then I observed that just as they had finished their song, a man came into the road, with a very pleasant countenance, and said,

Charming lines—charming lines those are, which you were singing; and well befitting this charming valley. It does my heart good to see pilgrims passing through this valley, and hear them singing the praises of their Lord and King.

Th. It becomes us, indeed, to praise our Lord and King, for he is a great and good being, and worthy to be loved and praised by all intelligent creatures.

Man. Yes; a great and good being, truly: And we can never love him enough. He is so kind to us, and is daily bestowing so many favors upon us, that we must be very ungrateful if we do not love and praise him.

Ard. He is, indeed, bestowing many and great blessings upon us, of which we are most undeserving; and a sense of his great goodness to us ought to humble us the more.

Man. True; we are very unworthy; and therefore we should love him the more for his great love to us, unworthy as we are.

Th. A deep sense of our unworthiness, and of the great mercies bestowed on us by our Lord and King, will not fail to fill our hearts with gratitude to him, if we feel as we ought. But I apprehend there are other reasons why we should love him, besides his kindness to us.

Man. O yes. His kindness to us is the best evidence of his goodness; but his kindness to our friends ought not to be forgotten, nor his kindness to the whole human race. There are, as you say, other reasons why we should love him, besides his kindness to us.

Th. His kindness to others will not fail to affect our hearts, if we love our neighbor as ourselves; but I alluded to the excellence of his character. I think we ought to love him for what he is in himself.

Man. Certainly; so I think. We ought to love him for what he is in himself. But he has told us what he is in himself: he is Love. He revealed himself to Moses, as "the Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, and transgression and sin." He is good, and his goodness renders him worthy to be loved and praised.

Th. That is true. It is his goodness that renders him worthy to be loved and praised. But his goodness is as really exercised in punishing some, as it is in bestowing mercy upon others. When he made the proclamation before Moses, of which you have recited a part, he did it in fulfilment of the promise, "I will make all my goodness pass before thee." And besides what you have quoted, he said also, "and that will by no means clear the guilty;" so that punishing the guilty is a manifestation of his goodness too;

and we ought to love him for his goodness in punishing sin, as really as we do for his goodness in pardoning it.

Man. I perceive we shall not disagree at all. It was indeed an expression of his kindness to the Israelites to destroy Pharaoh and his host in the Red Sea; and they could praise him for this as well as for opening the sea to let them pass through.

Th. I think that the greatest reason the Israelites had to praise God for destroying the Egyptians at the Red Sea, was, that it was a display of his glorious justice upon the Egyptians; and not merely because it was a deliverance to them.

Man. Yes, yes; you are right; I agree with you perfectly. It gives me great pleasure to meet and converse with pilgrims; and it would be gratifying to me, if you would call at my house and refresh yourselves. I reside a little further on, and keep a house for the entertainment of pilgrims.

Th. We have no occasion to stop, having lodged last night at the house of Stephanus, in this valley; and we wish to have the day before us, that we may get through the next valley before night.

Man. At the house of Stephanus? He is a very good man, and keeps an excellent house. I like him very much as a neighbor, and agree with him very well in my sentiments.

Th. I have heard of some who agree with every man they meet, and appear to have no opinion of their own on any subject.

Man. And you must allow that it is a very pleasant circumstance, when we can agree with those with whom we happen to be. Union is certainly a very pleasant thing.

Th. Yes; but when union is procured at the expense of truth and a good conscience, it costs more than it is worth.

Man. O yes. I agree with you there too. A good conscience is to be maintained. But I am so happy as to be of that disposition, that I can accommodate myself to my company, without doing any violence to my conscience. I have learned of the great apostle, "to become all things to all men;" and by this exercise of Christian condescension, I secure the friendship of all.

Th. Yes; I have heard of you. Your name is *Any-thing*. You have no fixed principles at all, unless it is the supreme love of yourself. You wish to be esteemed and caressed by every body; and to gain that end, you accommodate yourself to every one's opinions, pretending to think just as those do with whom you happen to be. You call it Christian condescension; but it is gross hypocrisy. And you abuse the apostle when you quote his condescension in things which were in themselves indifferent, to justify you in regarding every thing as indifferent. You flatter yourself that by these means you secure the friendship of all; but indeed you do not secure the lasting friendship of any one. For when good or bad men find out your double dealing, they all despise you.

Man. Oh, you are quite uncharitable. But I am in haste; so, good bye.

Then he turned off, on the left hand, to his house, which stood a little out of the way. And Ardent said to his companion,

Were you not a little too hard

upon him, brother? He seemed to talk very well.

Th. He showed his selfishness plainly enough, while at the same time he discovered his strong desire to please us, by trying to make us think he agreed with us in every thing. And as fast as he discovered my sentiments, he altered his statements, so as to make them come nearer to mine. I abhor such double dealing.

Ard. Is it not generally thought a mark of politeness to seem to yield a little of our statements in order to accommodate them to the sentiments of those with whom we happen to be?

Th. It may, perhaps, be generally thought so; but the great question ought to be, whether it is honest. A Christian must be a man of integrity; and I do not see how it can be consistent with integrity, to talk one way at one time, and the contrary at another, just according to our company. I cannot think it is any thing else than the basest hypocrisy, to talk in favor of certain opinions with one man, and against them with another, merely to please them and gain their favor.

Ard. Is it not sometimes, practised, to some extent by good men, in order to increase their influence, and in that way their opportunity to do good?

Th. I have known some, that I could not but hope were, on the whole, good men, who appeared to me to commit a great deal of sin in this way. We are not to do evil that good may come. And besides, this policy must, sooner or later defeat its own end.—For, when men discover that this is the practice of any one, it destroys their confidence in every thing he says. They perceive that he is more desirous of gaining their favour, than he is of maintaining truth; and they despise him for it. Honesty is always the best policy, in the end. When a man is known to speak nothing but what is strictly true, and to express no sentiments but what he honestly believes, his word will be depended on; and even those who do not like his sentiments will respect him for his integrity.

By this time I perceived that the pilgrims were about to enter the valley of the Shadow of Death; at the sight of which they felt their spirits sink, and a degree of gloom to come over their minds. Then Thoughtful plucked out his book, and read therein as follows: "The Lord is my rock, and my fortress, and my deliverer, my God, my strength, in whom I will trust: my deliverer, and the horn of my salvation, and my high tower. I will call upon the Lord, who is worthy to be praised: so shall I be saved from mine enemies. The Lord is my light, and my salvation, whom shall I fear? the Lord is the strength of my life, of whom shall I be afraid? Yea, though I walk through the valley of the Shadow of Death, I will fear no evil: for thou art with me; thy rod and thy staff, they comfort me." Then I observed that they went on, with more courage, carefully taking heed to their feet, lest they should fall into the ditch, on the one hand, or into the quagmire on the other. And the better to keep up their spirits, they sung:

"Lord what a wretched land is this,
That yields us no supply,
No cheering fruits, no wholesome trees,
Nor streams of living joy!

"Yet the dear path to thine abode
Lies through this horrid land:
Lord, we would keep the heavenly road,
And run at thy command.

"A thousand savage beasts of prey
Around the forest roam;
But Judah's Lion guards the way,
And guides the travellers home.

"Long nights and darkness dwell below,
With scarce a twinkling ray;
But the bright world to which we go,
Is everlasting day.

"By glimmering hopes, and gloomy fears,
We trace the sacred road,
Through dismal deeps and dangerous snares,
We make our way to God."

So Thoughtful went before, and Ardent being more afraid, followed close behind him. Then said Ardent, What a dismal place this is: I fear I shall never get through it. Then said Thoughtful, Let us remember the divine direction, "Wait on the Lord; be of good courage, and he shall strengthen thine heart; wait I say on the Lord." So they cried unto him that is able to help, and kept on their way, till they came towards the place near which was the mouth of the pit, and thought they heard most dismal groanings and wailings of those that were there tormented. And while Ardent was listening to these, his foot slipped, and he got into the quagmire, where he had probably sunk, had not his brother Thoughtful taken him by the hand, and helped him out. Oh, said Ardent, I shall perish here; I shall never get out of this dreadful place. I shall never see the celestial city.

Th. What makes you think so, brother? Others have been in this valley, as well as we, and got out safe. The pilgrim Christian passed through here in the night; and yet escaped without injury. Cheer up, brother. Only take heed to your steps, and trust in Him who is able to save.

Ard. Oh, my brother, if I could trust in him, I know he is able to save. But I fear I never had any true faith in him. Those who got through in safety, of whom you speak, were true friends to the Lord of the way, and he delivered them by the strength of his arm. But I fear I never had any true regard for him, and that he will now cut me off, as I deserve, and cast me out of his sight, as an abominable branch. My sins stare me in the face. From yonder horrible pit, I hear the groanings of such as I, with whom I shall shortly have my portion.

Th. Well, brother, you must judge your own heart for yourself. I have taken you for a sincere friend to the Lord of the way; but I know that the judgment of man is a poor dependence. You may have deceived yourself, and I may have deceived myself also. But this we know, brother, that our Lord and King will do us no injustice, if he does cast us off, and make us the monuments of his displeasure forever.

Ard. Oh no; he will do us no injustice. I deserve to perish; and if I do perish, he will be glorious forever. I think I rejoice in that.

Th. We know that it is written, "The Lord hath made all things for himself; yea, even the wicked for the day of evil." He has made us for himself; and he will dispose of us as shall be most for his glory. And how suitable it is, that he should dispose of us as his glory requires. How unreasonable would it be for us, to set up our own happiness as an object of more importance than his glory?

Ard. Oh yes; infinitely unreasonable. His glory is of more importance than my eternal salvation; and if one must be given up, he knows which is best; and I have nothing to say, if he

thinks proper to reject me. I deserve to perish.

Th. We deserve to perish. But it is for his glory to save some, and to destroy others. He knows what is best, and will do what is best. He will save those whom it is for his glory to save; and he will destroy those whom it is for his glory to destroy. And ought we not to rejoice, that we, and all others, are in the hands of one, who knows how to dispose of us, for time and eternity, in the best possible manner.

Ard. We ought to rejoice to be in his hands, as the clay is in the hands of the potter. And I do rejoice that I am in his hands. And if he thus say, with respect to me, "I have no delight in thee; behold here am I, let him do to me as seemeth good unto him."

Then I perceived that Ardent was greatly relieved in his mind; and they went on cheerfully, till they got past the mouth of the pit. Then said Ardent,

It was near this place that Christian was so confounded that he did not know his own voice, and mistook the blasphemous suggestions of the evil ones for the workings of his own heart. And I think I have just had something of the same nature; for it seemed as if some one whispered in my ear, "There is no celestial city—all religion is a delusion—the King's book, as it is called, is a forgery—when we die, we shall perish like the brutes." Can you tell me, brother, what it means?

Th. I conclude they must be the suggestions of the evil one. But take care that you do not make them your own, by entertaining them, and consenting to them in your heart. It is written, "Resist the devil, and he will flee from you."

Ard. I do not think they are mine, for I abhor them. I do believe the King's book is true, for I have felt its power upon my heart, in such a way as I think I never could have felt a mere forgery of men. But, since I have been troubled with such thoughts, I should like to converse with you a little upon the evidences we have that it is indeed the King's book.

Th. It is the word of the King, being written by his direction, or it is a forgery. If it is a forgery, it was made by good men, or by bad men. If it is a forgery, it could not have been the work of good men. Good men do not tell lies; but it is written in that book, "All scripture is given by inspiration of God—For the prophesy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." If it is a forgery, then it was made by wicked men. Is not this plain?

Ard. Yes; but it is said, bad men might make such a book, to serve their own wicked purposes.

Th. Let those, who say that, look into the book itself, and tell how such a book can be adapted to serve the purposes of wicked men. A book which condemns all dishonesty, and fraud, and hypocrisy; and teaches men to be honest and upright, even though they suffer for it; a book which requires us to do to others as we would they should do to us, and forbids us to seek revenge of those that injure us; which requires us to bear patiently every injury and insult, and to return good for evil unto all men; such a book cannot be the work of wicked men, to serve

their own wicked purposes. Its enemies themselves must admit, and are constrained to admit, that a universal compliance with its precepts would put an end to all wickedness, and promote the best happiness of mankind. Of all the books which bad men have made, to serve their own wicked purposes, there is none like that, its enemies themselves being judges.

Ard. This argument seems to me conclusive. But there are many others, I suppose.

Th. Yes. The argument from prophecy is a good one, with those who have sufficient knowledge of history to feel its force. But some men are so ignorant that they are incapable of being benefited much by it.

Ard. How do you state the argument from prophecy?

Th. None but God can foretel future events. But the Old Testament does very particularly foretel many events which have taken place, exactly as they were foretold, long since the Old Testament was written. This proves that the Old Testament was from God. And the same is true of the New Testament. The argument from the miracles of Jesus Christ, and from his resurrection and ascension to heaven, is a conclusive one also.

Ard. How do you state that?

Th. It will not be denied by any man of the least acquaintance with the history of those times, that there were such men as the apostles; and that they steadfastly affirmed that they saw the miracles they record, and especially, that they saw and conversed with Jesus, after he had been crucified and buried; and that they saw him ascend towards heaven, till a cloud carried him out of their sight. Now, these men have told the truth, or they have not. If they have not told the truth, they were impostors who meant to deceive others, or they were themselves deceived. But they could not have been themselves deceived as to the miracles they affirm they saw, nor as to the fact of the resurrection and ascension of Jesus. The things they affirmed, then, were true, or they were deceivers. But if they were deceivers, they must have had some motive to act as they did. What motive could have induced them to sacrifice their goods, their liberty, and their lives, in affirming what they knew to be a falsehood, when they might have saved all by acknowledging the truth; and when, if they knew what they affirmed was false, they could have no hope of gaining any thing by such affirmation? No sufficient motive can be assigned. To suppose men to do as they did, in such circumstances, and to lay down their lives, not in support of a falsehood they believed to be true, but in support of what they knew to be false, would be more incredible than any of the miracles they record. No; they were not deceivers. They were honest men, and really saw what they say they did. And the facts respecting the life, and death, and resurrection, and ascension, of Jesus, are true; and the gospel is true.

By this time, I perceived that they had got into that part of the valley which was full of snares, and traps, and nets, and pit-falls. But taking heed to their steps, they got along very well, till, at length, a dark cloud came over the sun, and a thick mist arose, so that they could not see. Now they were hard put

to it, and knew not what to do. But standing still, they cried unto Him that is able to help, saying, "Teach me thy way, O Lord, and lead me in a plain path, because of mine enemies." Then I perceived that the mist was soon dispersed, and the sun shone out again, so that they saw their way clearly. Then they said, "Blessed be the Lord, because he hath heard the voice of my supplication. The Lord is my strength, and my shield; my heart trusteth in him, and I am helped: therefore my heart greatly rejoiceth, and with my tongue will I praise Him." So they went on singing,

"I'll bless the Lord from day to day;
How good are all his ways!
Ye humble souls that use to pray,
Come help my lips to praise.

"Sing to the honor of his name,
How a poor sufferer cried;
Nor was his hope exposed to shame,
Nor was his suit denied.

"When threatening snares around me stood,
And endless fears arose,
Like the loud billows of a flood,
Redoubling all my woes:

"I told the Lord my sore distress,
With heavy groans and tears:
He gave my sharpest torment ease,
And silenced all my fears."

For the Christian Magazine.

YOUNG MEN IN PECULIAR DANGER OF DISREGARDING THE GOSPEL.

THE sovereignty of God is displayed in all his works; but in none more conspicuously than in the different circumstances in which he has placed mankind, in regard to their acceptance or rejection of the Gospel. It cannot be denied that some are placed in circumstances in which they have a better opportunity, and greater inducements to embrace the Gospel than others. Equally true is it, that some, either from the constitution of their nature, or the circumstances in which they are placed, are under stronger temptations than others to reject the Gospel. It has appeared to me, that *young men* are, in some respects, in greater danger of this sin, than any other class of people. Whether they are, *on the whole*, in greater danger of this than any others, I shall not attempt to decide; but I shall endeavour to show, that they are *in some respects*. They are, in some respects, in greater danger of disregarding the Gospel, than old people, or the middle-aged of either sex, or than females of their own age. But in what respects, my readers will inquire, are *young men* in peculiar danger of disregarding the Gospel? To this I answer,

1. From the *ardour of youth*. There is in youth an ardour of feeling, and a consequent flow of the spirits, which, although it ought not and need not have this effect, actually does often prevent that serious reflection, which is essential to the exercise and practice of true religion. In consequence of this ardour of feeling, the minds of young men are often wholly captivated with the objects of time and sense. They give the solemnities of eternity no place in their minds. They allow themselves no time for serious meditation. They feel no interest, and take no pleasure in the things of religion. The world with its thousand delusive charms, has the entire possession of their hearts, and with little sense of their guilt, and little apprehension of their danger, they give their whole time and attention to its pursuits and enjoyments. I know not that there is any difference in this

respect between young men, and youth of the other sex, except that the enjoyments of the world are more within the reach of the former than the latter, and open before them in a richer and more variegated prospect. For this reason, young men, are more in danger of being led by the ardour of their feelings to neglect religion, than even females of their own age, who are not less influenced by the world than they, so far as their circumstances bring them in contact with it. But the ardour of youth, inflamed as it is by the circumstances in which young men are placed, has a most powerful influence in banishing serious reflection from their minds, and hurrying them forward in a course of sin. The ardour of youth is a source of danger, to which even men, advanced in years, are not exposed. With them the aberrations of fancy are corrected by experience, and the ardour of youth abated by the advancement of age. If they have been well educated, reason and judgment have now taken the place of imagination and feeling; and were it not for the inveteracy of their habits, the prospect of their truly embracing the Gospel would be more favourable. Confirmed habits of sin are the peculiar danger of the aged: the ardour of youth, that of the young. The alarming consequences of each may be prevented by the proper use of means, attended with the grace of God. But each of them is often instrumental of carrying their unhappy subjects to endless ruin.

2. Besides the ardour of youth, which is common almost in an equal degree in youth of both sexes, there is a constitutional *hardihood* in young men which is peculiarly unfavourable to the influence of religious impressions. That there is a constitutional difference in the minds of males and females in this respect, will, it is believed, be doubted by none who have attentively observed the early indications of mental action. At a very early age, males exhibit a more bold, intrepid, daring and persevering spirit than females. They are less susceptible of impressions, less disposed to reflection, more regardless of danger, and less influenced by threats or entreaty, to alter the course which they are inclined to pursue. The truth of all this may appear very probable, even to those whose observation has given them no information upon the subject, from a remark almost universal among parents, that boys are harder to govern than girls. This original difference, in the structure of mind, in the two classes of which I am speaking, more easily conceived than described, lays the foundation for very important results in regard to religion. Although in itself, it is not of a moral nature, and exists in perfect consistency with the fact, that both males and females are alike naturally destitute of holiness, and wholly inclined to sin; yet it becomes the occasion of an ultimate and very important difference in their moral, and religious characters. That more resolute, bold, intrepid and daring spirit, by which males in childhood are distinguished from the other sex, and which renders them less affected by the instruction of their parents and others, and more disposed to resist any efforts which may be made to alter the course which they wish to pursue, renders them in youth less affected

with the view which the Gospel presents of their character and condition, and more disposed to turn a deaf ear to its offers and its threatenings. It is not a better established fact, that children of the male sex are more heedless than females in regard to the instruction of their parents, and less frequently brought into subjection to their authority, than it is, that young men are more heedless than those of the other sex in regard to the calls, and invitations, and threatenings of the Gospel, and less frequently made the partakers of its saving benefits. But there is another source of danger, to which they are exposed, equal if not greater, than either the ardour of their youth, or the constitutional hardness and intrepidity of their spirits, and that is,

3. The influence of the *circumstances* in which they perform their several parts in life. These, it is well known, are essentially different from those of females. While the employment of females confines them for the most part at home, that of young men carries them abroad. The one enjoy all the advantages of retirement, where they in general have favorable opportunities for serious reflection, and where the scenes with which they are most conversant often invite them to this. (The mind in solitude, and even in that degree of retirement which is enjoyed in the domestic state, is often prone to reflection.) The other are frequently abroad, amidst the noise and confusion of business, where innumerable foreign objects attract their attention, and where perhaps they are perplexed with concerns so numerous and important, as to allow but little time, and still less inclination for serious thought. This distraction of business and weight of care, to which men are often exposed, is a dangerous thing to their souls. It is so represented in scripture. And facts demonstrate that in these circumstances very few truly embrace the Gospel. They often indeed hear the Gospel preached; but "the cares of the world, the deceitfulness of riches, and the lust of other things choke the word, and it becometh unfruitful."

4. The avocations of young men expose them to peculiar *temptations*. Their intercourse with the world is so much more frequent and extensive than that of females, that it often presents itself to them in more attractive forms. They more frequently hear the vain and sinful conversation of the wicked, and more frequently feel the influence of their destructive example. In that retirement which the greater part of females enjoy, the world is but imperfectly seen. But to young men, whose business requires them to be conversant with its various transactions, it presents itself in all its fair, delusive charms. This is a temptation which they, in the ardour of youth, borne on by the bold, daring spirit of their sex, and with hearts naturally inclined to evil, seldom resist. The numerous schemes for the acquisition of wealth, the offices of distinction which are to be filled, and the various ways in which the world may be enjoyed, so attract their attention, and captivate their hearts, that the things of religion all become tasteless and insipid. Besides, amidst these temptations, what multitudes not only remain irreligious, but become notoriously immoral. Consider one moment the temptations

to which a mere man of business is exposed, and reflect upon the multitudes within your own knowledge, who have not only continued to live without hope and without God in the world, but lost their characters by some species of fraud or dishonesty, of which they have been guilty. Consider the temptations to art and intrigue, to bribery and corruption, to which the civilian is exposed, and the numerous instances in which these have not only kept men from truly embracing the Gospel of Jesus Christ, but led them to the commission of crimes, the foul stain of which can never be taken from their characters. Consider the vain glory of a military life, the various vices and crimes to which men engaged in its duties are exposed, and the numerous instances in which they have fallen before the temptations which beset them. When we consider how numerous are the avocations of men, how frequently and closely these bring them in contact with the vices of the world, and how powerful are the temptations which they have to encounter, compared with those presented before females in their retirement, we have some faint conception of the peculiar danger which they are in, of disregarding the Gospel. Now just what might be expected from the influence of these circumstances, in connexion with that constitutional hardihood by which young men are distinguished from the other sex, is found to be true in fact. There are comparatively few males that are truly religious. Much the greater part of those who profess the religion of Jesus, and much the greater part of those who appear by their conduct and conversation to possess it, are females. This, from all the knowledge, which I can gather upon the subject, appears always to have been the case. Although a great number of both sexes have, from the earliest ages of Christianity, espoused the cause of Christ; yet females have been the most numerous among his followers, and, in proportion to their circumstances and means, his warmest and most efficient friends. It was at the house of Martha and Mary, that Christ, when on earth, was the most frequently and hospitably entertained. It was a woman, that washed his feet with her tears, and wiped them with the hair of her head. It was a woman, that procured a box of very precious ointment, and poured it on his head, and thus beforehand anointed his body to the burial. It was females that followed him weeping to the cross, even while his disciples of the other sex forsook him and fled. It was by females that sweet spices were prepared to embalm his body for the tomb. And females too were the first to be at his sepulchre after the Sabbath was past. Even while it was yet dark, they hastened to behold the place where their Lord was laid, and were the first to discover that he had risen from the dead.

In nearly all of our churches there is a majority of females. In most instances, the proportion is as great as three to one. And what is worthy of our particular notice in this place is, there are not more instances of apparent self-deception, or of apostacy from their profession among females, in proportion to their number, than there are among males. From the deep interest which they as a body, are known

to take in the cause of Christ, and from their numerous exertions to promote its prosperity in the world, they give at least their full proportion of evidence, that their profession is the result of sound principle. As to the cause of so many more females than males being truly pious, I know it must be traced ultimately to the sovereign grace of God. We must say in view of this, as we are obliged to say in regard to the reasons of other distinctions which he makes among his creatures, "even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight." But we know that in all his operations for the accomplishment of his purposes, he makes use of means, and the means he uses are often distinctly to be seen, when the design of his conduct is beyond our comprehension. So it is in this case, the means, or that which seems to be the occasion of the piety of so many more females, than males, is perfectly obvious. That tenderness and sensibility of nature, which disposes them to hear and attend more seriously to the calls of the Gospel, and prepares them to receive more deep and lasting impressions from the word of God, in connexion with the retired circumstances in which they are placed, where they are in a great measure free from the temptations, to which the other sex are exposed, and in which there are so many occurrences, naturally tending to lead them to serious thought and reflection, are among the means which God employs in bringing them to Christ. They are by nature no better than the other sex. Nor is their conversion to God any less the effect of his special grace, than the conversion of others, as the numerous instances in which they, in all these circumstances so favourable to piety, remain "dead in trespasses and sins," and "treasure up to themselves wrath against the day of wrath, and the revelation of the righteous judgment of God." But the fact, that their constitution and circumstances are, in themselves, more favourable as means of piety, than those of the other sex, it was important to mention in order not only to explain another fact which has been thought difficult to account for, but to show young men the peculiar danger of their condition. And surely if it be a fact that they are naturally less given to serious reflection, than the other sex, and placed in circumstances in which more numerous and powerful temptations to sin, beset them, they are in greater danger of neglecting the Gospel. And how can they avoid perceiving, that they are in these dangerous circumstances, when they consider the well-known and striking fact, that few comparatively of their sex do truly embrace the Saviour?

I know very well, that infidelity has often suggested, and will doubtless continue to suggest, that religion is all a delusion, the effect of a disordered imagination; and has brought in proof of its assertion, the fact that a much larger proportion of females are the subjects of it than males. But to say nothing of the gross and unfounded reflection which this suggestion casts upon the understanding of females, and the equal incivility with which it treats a respectable porton of the other sex, it will be sufficient to observe that it involves its own refutation. If religion is the effect of a disordered imagination, because a larger proportion of its

subjects are females, then morality is nothing but a name; for it is an unquestionable fact, that females as a body, are as much more moral than males, as they are religious. The proportion of females that are temperate, that are free from profaneness, that are not chargeable with dishonest and fraudulent practices, that do not openly profane the Sabbath, and in short that are habitually upright in their external deportment, is as much greater than that of males as is the number of those who profess religion. All the reproach which infidelity has cast upon religion as the result of female weakness, falls with all its weight upon every species of morality. Unless a person is prepared to attribute the whole round of social virtues, and all that is moral and praiseworthy in external deportment, to a deficiency of intellect, let him, as he regards his own reputation for sense, be cautious how he stigmatizes religion as the effect of weakness, on the ground, that females are the most numerous among its friends.

Young men are liable to disregard the Gospel of Jesus Christ, from another cause, which has not yet been distinctly considered, and that is,

5. The example of superior numbers. There is now, and there always has been, a vast majority of young men, which disregard the Gospel of Christ. There is a greater proportion of *young* men, that neglect the salvation of the Gospel, than of any other class whatever. There is a greater proportion of young, than of *old* men. There is a greater proportion of young *men*, than of the youth of the other sex. Now it is well known that the influence of numbers is peculiarly great. There is nothing more natural for young men, than to follow the multitude, even to do evil. While, therefore, they see that the great body of their companions are living securely in sin, that true religion is unfashionable, and that to possess and practise it, they must come out from among the world and be, in a measure, separate, how powerful is their temptation to disregard the Gospel. Let all of this description, who may cast their eyes upon these pages, consider their danger, and escape for their lives. D.

From Zion's Herald.

AN IMAGINARY DIALOGUE BETWEEN ST. PAUL AND ST. LUKE.

Luke. Did you see that prophet?

Paul. I did.

L. What do you think of him?

P. I believe him to be a servant of the Most High God.

L. Did you hear what he said?

P. I heard him praise the Lord and magnify the name of Jesus.

L. But did you hear what he said when he took up your girdle?

P. I did not: what was it?

L. He bound his own hands and feet with it, and predicted that in the same manner the Jews at Jerusalem should bind the man that owned that girdle. —Now I hope you will not go up to Jerusalem, and expose yourself to imprisonment.

P. Would you have me grieve and disobey the Spirit of God?

L. We feel very sorry to be deprived of your company, advice, and prayers. The people of God in this place are weeping and groaning on account of your

expected absence. Should you be imprisoned they would feel like orphan children.

P. God is their Father: He can comfort them: His presence can make them happy without me, but mine cannot give them comfort unless the Lord is with them.

L. But think how gloomy it must be to be bound by your enemies, torn from the society of friends, deprived of all religious privileges, and shut up in a dreary dungeon.

P. Ah! I have not forgotten the dungeon of Phillippi. That was dark and dreary: our feet were made fast in the stocks; but Jesus was there: and we were happy; so happy, that we could not refrain from singing praises to God at midnight. And cannot the same Saviour, who blessed my soul in a Phillippian jail, give me comfort in a Jewish dungeon?

L. I know He *can.*

P. And I believe He *will.*

L. But you know that God has made you the apostle to the Gentiles; and who will bear the standard of Christ, among the heathen, when you are shut up in prison?

P. Though Agabus has foretold imprisonment, yet he has not predicted how long it will continue. Perhaps the same angel who was sent to lead Peter out of prison, when he was guarded by a number of soldiers, may be sent to rescue unworthy me, who am less than the least of all saints.

L. Have you any assurance that you will be miraculously delivered?

P. Not in particular: but I believe if it is for the glory of God, that it will be so. And if not, who knows how much good I may do while in chains.—"And shall deliver him to the Gentiles," said the prophet.—Perhaps some lordly heathen magistrate may thus receive the word of truth from my lips. Or should I never have another opportunity to preach the Gospel, God may raise up hundreds, in my place, wiser and better than I am, who may blow the Gospel trumpet.—While my rattling chains may speak intelligibly and powerfully to Christians and ministers of this age and succeeding ages, "Be not afraid to suffer for Christ."

L. But are you certain that it is your duty to go?

P. Yes, God has revealed it to me by his Spirit.

L. O forgive us; we can but weep when we think of your imprisonment and approaching sufferings. We cannot bear to think that ——

P. Forbear, forbear, I entreat you. Bonds! prisons! scourges! death! none of these things move me. But these flowing tears———these groans—Lord help me.—Brethren, why will you rend my heart by your pity? I am willing to submit, not only to bonds, but to death itself for my Lord and Master. At Jerusalem, too, where I was brought up at the feet of Gamaliel; where I persecuted the Christians so furiously; where my Saviour suffered for me; there let me suffer for Him. O Jesus, my life is but a poor return for all thy goodness to me.

L. Brethren, we must submit; God has called him and he must go. Let us say, "The will of the Lord be done."

P. O praise the Lord for giving you grace to feel resigned. Brethren, see the glory, see the crown.—"If we suffer, we shall also reign with Him." Think

of heaven—there we hope to meet you—and meet our Jesus too. Farewell, the Lord bless you. X. O.

APHORISM.

Never do misanthrophy and selfishness present a more distinct and hateful appearance, than when they are seen impelling a person to heighten the defects and depreciate the merits of others. It is then they impart to their subject the characteristics of a demon, who, though unseen, mingles with the unsuspecting victims marked out for his fury, spreading destruction on all sides by his pestilential breath.

Review.

For the Christian Magazine.

Two Discourses on the Nature of Sin, delivered before the Students of Yale College, July 30, 1826, *by Eleazer T. Fitch.* New-Haven, Treadway & Adams, pp. 46.

These Discourses are founded on Rom. v. 14; "*Sin is not imputed, when there is no law.*" The design of them is, to illustrate, establish, and apply, the following proposition; "*Sin, in every form and instance, is reducible to the act of a moral agent, in which he violates a known rule of duty.*" In this definition of sin, the author includes those of *heart and life*, of *omission and commission*, of *knowledge and ignorance*. "Sins of the *heart*, are those acts of will, which lie concealed in the breast of the moral agent,—*immanent* acts, which consist in the preference of good forbidden, to the good required to be sought; while sins of the *life* are those exercises of the will, which are expressed in external and visible conduct among men,—*imperative* acts, which command to the pursuit of chosen good the actions of the body. Sins of *omission* are those acts of the moral agent, which employ him in ways that differ from the positive requirements of duty; while those of *commission* are such as are directly prohibited by duty. Sins of *ignorance* are those acts, in which the moral agent transgresses the known obligation to acquaint himself with laws that were applicable, or some known general obligation of morality, from which he might have inferred the given law; while those of *knowledge* are the acts, in which he violates the obligation, which arises from a knowledge of the given published law itself."

With this explanation of his proposition, the author proceeds to establish it, by "proofs gathered from the *operations of our consciences;* the universal *convictions* of mankind; the *views of God*, as revealed in his law, judgment, and testimony; and from the *propriety, in the nature of things*, of charging sin and blameworthiness, on moral agents, for

their *actions* only." In application of his subject, the author introduces the following remarks: "1. The fact, that all sin consists in the transgression of law, teaches us not to confound with *sin itself*, the *ground of its certainty*. 2. There is not a *sinful heart*, in any moral agent, *distinct from* his own *sinful choices*, *determinations*, or *preferences*. 3. In the connexion of Adam with his posterity, *no sin of his* is reckoned *theirs*. 4. The subject may assist us in making a right explanation of *original sin*. And 5. We learn why all sinners should be convicted of their sinfulness, blame only themselves for it, and be required to break off from it immediately by righteousness."

Having thus given the plan of Professor Fitch's Discourses, we shall extract several passages, for the purpose of exhibiting more fully his sentiments and manner. The following is from his fourth and last argument in support of his proposition, in which he insists upon the *reasonableness* of supposing that sin must lie exclusively in the wrong choices or actions of moral agents.

"Sin *must* lie, either in the *consequences* of wrong choices of the agent, or in the *causes* of them, or else in the *wrong choices themselves*. But sin cannot lie simply in the *consequences* of wrong choices, that they occasion evil to others. For although it may be true that sin does in most cases occasion evil to others, yet the sin itself is distinct from the evil flowing from it, nor does it essentially consist in its actually occasioning evil to others. For, ravenous beasts may occasion evil to others by their conduct, as well as men; and among men, it may be that the worst sins in them may be prevented from actually bringing evil on others, and their best conduct, on the other hand, (as in the administration of salutary correction,) may occasion it in a high degree.

"Nor can sin lie in the *causes* that influence an agent to sinful choices. I mean any cause which precedes in the order of nature, and renders certain the sinful determinations and choices of the agent. For although a previous choice, which was wrong, may influence an agent in making a present wrong choice, yet to make a present sin consist in its being occasioned by a previous choice which was wrong, would equally require us to make the sin of that previous choice itself, to lie, not in itself, but in some previous sinful choice of the agent which influenced him to it; and so on, till we come to the first choice or act of will in the series, which could have no act of will preceding it to constitute it sin,—so that on this position there could be no such thing as sin in the whole series of acts from first to last. Besides: many things influence an agent to a present determination of will, aside from previous determinations: things which are wholly out of his own being, and pertain wholly to the agency of others: and to make his sin lie in such a cause of his determinations, and not in his determinations themselves, would be to make that pertain to his being which did not pertain to his being.

"If then it be absurd to suppose that sin should be referred to the consequences of sinful determinations of the will, or to the influential causes, it is obvious that the sin of the agent can lie in nothing else but the wrong choices themselves, of which he is the immediate author." pp. 12, 13.

Our next extract is from the second general remark in the application, the design of which is to show that "there is *not* a sinful heart, in any moral agent, *distinct from* his own sinful *choices*, *determinations*, or *preferences*."

"Many entertain confused notions respecting the real nature of a sinful heart; as though it were some physical, incontrollable, source of sin, existing apart from the active agency of the being or his determinations; and to be blamed, or he to be blamed for it, as being sinful because it is so very unlovely in its nature and consequences; and because the existence of a reservoir of a different kind, that should flow out in good volitions, would be in its nature so very lovely

and excellent; and as though the being who has such a physical, incontrollable reservoir of sin placed within him, separate, in its origin and continuance, from his own agency, had nothing to do about removing it and putting a better in its stead; but must live on, only as a passive spectator of its irresistible overflowings, and see it flow on and flow out forever.

"I do not indeed deny the propriety of using such language as a sinful heart, or sinful affections, or a sinful disposition, but of connecting with such terms the idea that the heart, to which the epithets sinful, depraved, wicked, are applied, exists in any thing apart from the active preferences of the agent himself. They are but immanent acts of the soul in man, as distinguished from those which are imperative or executive, which command the actions of the body, and are accomplished in the outward life; and they are sinful, on the same ground that outward or visible acts of the agent are, and on no other, because they are choices, or acts of the agent, in which he violates known obligation.

"Nor is there any thing in the scriptural account of the heart which should lead us to take any other view of the subject, than that which is presented to us by the subject of these discourses. The Hebrews spake of the literal heart, as the bodily organ in which the operations of the understanding and will, and the passive emotions of joy and sorrow, centred. Hence, with reference to the understanding, such expressions occur so frequently in the Old Testament as, a wise heart—wisdom of heart—an understanding heart—wise in heart—a heart to devise, on the one hand; and on the other, the foolish heart—the heart of fools—and foolishness in the heart: and with reference to the will, such expressions as the following: a good heart—an obedient heart—a heart to do good; and an evil heart—a rebellious heart—a heart to do evil: and also with reference to the emotions of joy and sorrow, such expressions as, a sad and merry heart—a heavy and light heart—a heart of anguish and a heart of rejoicing." pp. 19, 20.

In the following passage, the author expresses his views still more clearly on the same subject.

"The restriction of the sinful heart to actual *preferences* of the agent is not only inferred from the subject of these Discourses, but is the view which is best conformed to the representations of the scriptures. For on the view that the sinful heart is but the sinful determinations of the moral agent, not only can all the expressions which speak of a heart or refer to the relation of cause and effect in the conduct of moral agents be consistently understood, but also all the requirements which they make of sinners are manifested to be just, as on no other view they could be. For the requisition laid upon the sinner to avoid sin, is but requiring him, in a present or future act of will, under his known obligations, to make such a choice as corresponds with his obligations; and the requisition laid upon him to change his heart, is, in amount, no more; but requiring the moral agent who has hitherto preferred one ultimate object of choice, now, at the present time, to prefer, instead of it, another ultimate object of choice, which is the demand of that which he has power to do, and obviously just; while an avoidance of particular sins, or a change of heart on any other view, however worthy other objects of choice might be in themselves, would be that which the sinner himself had no natural power to perform; and the demand of it be unjust." p. 22.

The following is from the closing remark of the Discourses, in which the author insists, that the view he has taken of sin brings *all the blame of it upon the sinner.*

"There is reason why all sinners should take wholly to themselves all the blame of their sin. They stand accused in their own consciences, and in the judgment of God, of choosing their good in the world, and the selfish gratification of their own appetites, and for such ends, neglecting or opposing all their high and solemn obligations to God and others. And where now shall they throw the blame? Shall they, like Adam, throw it on beings around, because they used so much influence, or permitted it to be

used over them in regard to sin? Ah, it is true that others may have sinned, and may have sinned too with respect to them; but then, their sin is all summed up in their *own doings!* Shall they throw the blame on God, that he permits so much influence to be exerted over them in favour of sin, and uses no more himself to recall them to the way of life? Ah, it is God who follows them with entreaties and remonstrances; who removes every unfavourable influence and brings in every favourable one, that he consistently can do, to turn their feet into the way of life—but they will walk in the road to death. Whom then shall they blame for their sin but themselves; when it is summed up, simply, in their *own doings?* Every sinner, then, ought immediately and willingly to throw on himself alone, to the exclusion of every other being, all the blame of the impiety, and the rebellion, and the ingratitude, and the hardness, and the malice, involved in his many violated obligations. Let the law he has violated come home to his conscience in all its extent, in all its purity, in all its excellence; and let him, in all the revelation it makes of his guilt, throw on himself, alone, the blame." p. 33.

The leading sentiment of these Discourses is one to which we yield our most cordial assent. And although it "appears so very plain, and so very like an axiom in morals," still, as "it is denied by some, and deviated from by still more, in their explanations of kindred subjects," it was well worthy the labor of Professor Fitch to establish it, as he has here done, by plain and substantial proof. And we congratulate the lovers of what we conceive to be truth in regard to the disputed subject of *taste* and *exercises*, on their being able, henceforward, to enrol the learned Professor among their number. The exposition which he has given of sin, as being a property exclusively of moral *exercises* or *actions;* and the point, which he so satisfactorily establishes, that "there is *not* a sinful *heart*, in any moral agent, *distinct from* his own sinful *choices*, *determinations*, or *preferences*"—these are sufficient pledges of the correctness of his views, on the important subject to which we have here referred.

But there is another point incidentally touched in these Discourses, on which, if we understand the writer, we shall not be able so readily to agree with him. Indeed, we do not see at present how he can be made consistent with himself. On one page,* he seems "to deny that *self-determining power*" of the will, which is "the foundation of the Arminian and Pelagian errors, and the subversion of the doctrines of grace;" and yet, in several places, he represents man as "*originating*," or as being "the *efficient*" and "*immediate author*" of his actions. Now we may be charged with a want of metaphysical acuteness, but we do and must say, that if the will of man has the power of "*originating* action"—if it is "the *efficient* and *immediate author*" of its own volitions; we cannot see, why it does not *determine itself*—why it is not *self-moved*—or, in other words, why it does not possess a *self-determining power*. We shall not here go into any argument with Professor Fitch, on the subject of man's originating his own actions; but would merely say, that what we humbly conceive to be his error on this subject, we also think was a great embarrassment to him, in the composition of some parts of these Discourses. Had he carried the agency of God as far as we believe the scriptures carry it, regarding him as "*working* in us to *will* and to *do*," and as being

* See page 14.

the grand *efficient*, not only in the natural, but in the *moral* world; he would have found less difficulty in connecting the sinful characters of men with the first sin of their first father, or in accounting for the admitted moral certainty, that all human agents will begin to act wrong.

The style of Professor Fitch, if these Discourses may be regarded as a specimen, is variable. In some parts, it is strong, expressive, and elegant; while in others, the sentences seem to us to be rather stiffly and even carelessly constructed. The Discourses bear marks of having been "written in the haste of a weekly preparation for the Sabbath," and lack, in some places, that neatness of execution, which a thorough revision would doubtless have given them. Their characteristic defect, so far as style is concerned, is—not ambiguity—but *obscurity*. The sense is given, with sufficient preciseness; but it sometimes requires close attention, not to say *study*, in order to perceive it. And the punctuation is often so irregular, as to increase the obscurity, if not, in fact, to create it.

But notwithstanding the imperfections, at which we have hinted, we regard these Discourses, on the whole, with much satisfaction. They are obviously the production of no common mind. They give a strong and generally correct view of a most important subject. Unlike the senseless and vapid productions, which are often palmed upon the world (and by popular preachers too) under the name of sermons, they are rich in thought—full of important meaning and instruction—and will well repay an attentive and repeated perusal.

Religious Intelligence.

FOREIGN.

PROTESTANT EVANGELICAL MISSIONARY SOCIETY.—FRANCE.

THE "Society for Evangelical Missions among nations not Christian," held its third annual meeting at Paris, on the 14th of April.

After concluding his long and animating address at the opening of the meeting, the President was informed that the hall, where they were assembled, was entirely full, and great numbers were unable to enter. The Society on hearing this, removed to the Reformed Church.

From the Annual Report, it appears, that the Committee are signally devoted to the interests of the Society, and assiduous in their efforts to increase its strength and usefulness: nor are their efforts without success. Eleven new Auxiliaries were added during the year, to the thirteen previously existing. The receipts into the treasury, amounted to 34,369 francs. The Protestant clergy are greatly interested in this Society, and support it with their influence.

"Let us rejoice," say the Committee, "at seeing the pastors of our churches, every where, almost without exception, taking the lead in these religious operations, which give so much cause to bless God."

This Society has under its patronage, a Seminary for the education of missionaries, which contains six pupils, represented to be ardently devoted to the cause of missions, and assiduous in qualifying themselves to engage in it. Other young men are preparing to enter this school.

President Edwards' Tract on Union

in Prayer for the spread of the Gospel, has been republished and circulated. The Monthly Concert for prayer is extensively regarded by the Protestant churches, and collections in aid of missions, are taken, as in this country; the poor, and children in the Sunday Schools, bring in their mites; female auxiliaries, and associations of various classes of people, are formed; and in all the movements of the Protestant churches, relative to missions, we may trace the operation of real piety; and encouraged by the rapid progress made during the last three or four years, we may hope, that the time is drawing nigh, when France will not only be evangelized itself, but when it will become a powerful ally to those nations which are engaged in sending the Gospel to the heathen.

All this feeling and these active increasing efforts are among the Protestants of France—a body of Christians, which has been struggling for existence these three centuries, and which is now depressed and overborne by the Catholics.—*Miss. Her.*

DOMESTIC.

STATE OF RELIGION.

THE prospects of the church in our land are peculiarly favorable at the present time. No year, perhaps, since the settlement of our country, has commenced with so many revivals of religion. These are not confined to one state or district. In almost every part of our land, God is raising up pious men on the spot, to elevate the standard of morals, and Christian activity; and thus is kindling lights here and there, over our extended territory, which we trust he will cause to burn brighter, and to increase until our whole land, and the hearts of all its inhabitants, are enlightened and purified by the holy influences of his Spirit.

It would occupy too much room, to give any details, or even to give a general statement of all the revivals, of which accounts are received in our weekly religious papers. While it would be delightful to rehearse the accounts of them all, it is still more delightful to know that they are too numerous to be rehearsed. A few only of great extent, or otherwise of peculiar interest, will be mentioned.

It is interesting to know that one of our southern colleges has been visited with the influences of the Holy Spirit. This has been the case with Athens College, in Georgia. This revival has extended to the inhabitants of the town, and 50 have, as is hoped, been born again. About 30 of these are students in the college. Many besides have been added to the Baptist and Methodist churches.

Washington, in that state, has also been blessed in a similar way, and about 100, besides many among the colored population, have been hopefully converted. There was much serious inquiry existing at Milledgeville while the Legislature of the state was in session at that place, and several of the members of that body were anxiously attending to the subject of religion.

At Fayetteville, N. C. 35 were added to the church within seven months. Between 50 and 100 have been added to the church in Spottsylvania, Va.

In Danville and Harrodsburgh, Ky. 100 each;—in Stanford, 20.

At Easton, Pa. there is a revival, in which it is supposed that 30 or 40 have been made new creatures in Christ. There is also a revival in Carlisle, and several of the students of Dickinson college, situated in that town, have been the subjects of it.

In Cayuga Presbytery, N. Y., nine out of the 42 churches connected with it, have been favored with the peculiar influences of the Holy Spirit; 900 have been hopefully converted, and 607 have been added to the churches.

In Oneida County, there have recently been revivals in 30 towns, and *more than three thousand* are indulging the hope that they have been reconciled to God. In Ogden more than 100 are indulging a similar hope: 55 of them are heads of families. In Ogdenburgh Presbytery, the number of converts amounts to about 500. Various other towns in the central and western part of the state, have enjoyed similar seasons of gracious visitation. In the eastern parts of the State also, there is an increased attention to the subject of religion. In Troy, Canaan, Brunswick, and New-Lebanon, there are powerful revivals of religion.

In the vicinity of Hartford, Con. there are also revivals. Within 26 miles of Hartford, including Springfield, Mass., 700 were added to the churches on the first Sabbath in January. There are revivals also in the vicinity of New London, and the most animating prospect in many other parts of the state.

In Providence, R. I. a revival has very recently begun;—and another in Plymouth, Mass. In Boston, and a considerable number of towns in its vicinity, the Holy Spirit is leading numbers to inquire anxiously what they shall do to be saved, and causing many to rejoice in hope. In addition to these, there are many towns in the counties of Worcester, Hampshire, and Berkshire, where men are pressing into the kingdom of heaven. The same is true of many towns in the state of Vermont:—in Barre, it is hoped that 200 have very recently been born again.

About thirty towns in New Hampshire are now enjoying a season of refreshing from the presence of the Lord. Most of these are in the south-eastern part of the state.

It must be obvious to all, that the Head of the church is greatly strengthening the cause of religion by these revivals. He is strengthening it in the heart of our country, and at the extremities. The number of those who pray and set a pious example, and by their daily conduct elevate the standard of morals, is greatly increased. The number of those who will contribute of their property to disseminate Bibles, and Religious Tracts, and to send preachers of the Gospel to the destitute parts of our land, and to heathen lands, and to aid every other benevolent institution, is greatly increased. Many of the subjects of these revivals are young, and not a few of them, having experienced the power and excellency of the Gospel themselves, will undoubtedly endeavor to become preachers of it to others; and to them we may look for a supply for those churches, which the death of their fathers will soon leave vacant, and to them we may look too, for heralds to carry the Gospel to the destitute parts of our country, and to all the dark places of the earth.

Miss. Herald.

Obituary Notice.

MRS. LUCINDA WRIGHT.

DIED, at *Ai-ik-hun-nuh*, in the Choctaw nation, Mrs. LUCINDA WRIGHT, the wife of Mr. David Wright, Assistant Missionary at that station. The following brief notice of her, is from the pen of Mr. Byington, whose principal residence is at Ai-ik-hun-nuh. The letter was addressed to the Corresponding Secretary.

After stating, that, early in October, he accompanied her to Mayhew, where, as her health did not improve, she remained but a short time, he proceeds:

"She came home, hoping to do something, and performed a few days' labor. But on Saturday, the 5th of November, she was severely attacked with a bilious disease. Her husband was then alone. He did that for her, which he thought most judicious; but with little, if any, effect. He sent to Mayhew for assistance, and Mr. Cushman, Dr. Hand, and Miss Burnham came. But they could not stay the arm of the Almighty. On the morning of the 13th, our dear sister died. Her remains were removed to Mayhew, where our widowed brother also went, with his two little children. Soon after the burial had taken place, the little son, who had been sick, became more unwell, with the same disease that was sent upon his mother, and on Friday, the 17th, he slept the sleep of death, and now lies near his mother's side, in the grave yard, and we hope that his spirit is with her in glory.

"You may wish to know all the particulars respecting her illness, and of her conversation as she drew near the grave. These, I trust, you will learn fully and accurately from Mr. Wright. I rejoice to say to you, however, that our sister, as we hope, was prepared, by the grace of God, to meet death. The subject of death had, for some time previous to her sickness, been a subject of familiar conversation between her and her husband.

I remember, also, that while riding with her for the last time, we spoke of it, and I was pleased with the solemn manner in which she conversed about it. When first informed, that it was probable she could not live long, she was not much agitated. She said, it was sweet resting in the arms of everlasting love. Her mind was clear, calm, and much absorbed with the thoughts of eternity.

"I mention these things to you, that you, as well as we, may have a view of the grace of God toward her, while going down to the grave, and may be comforted, from good reasons, with the hope that she is in heaven.

"Although the church of God, looking at it as militant and triumphant, has lost nothing by this and by a thousand other deaths; although the church is safe, and can lose nothing; yet, we poor, feeble worms, feel that we have sustained a great loss. You know our situation; and you are far from being a stranger to the good character, to the many valuable qualifications, with which it pleased the Head of the church to endow our departed sister. My feelings lead me to dwell upon the memory of the dead. A grateful sense of her kindness urges me to bear testimony respecting her many labors and cares, not only for me, and the family, and the various friends who called on us; but also for the heathen; much did she do for the sick and wounded in this village; and much did she do to teach the young women around us to read, and write, &c. I think, sir, I can say, that, during all the summer past, she had a growing love for her work, and for her Saviour; and felt, that this land was her home, —at least, more so than any other place."

Mr. Byington adds concerning her, in the conclusion of his letter, as follows:

"Our departed friend had, in early life, been favored with a good education. Her mind was well stored with information, which she had gained from books and observation. She possessed, in no common degree—what some are denied—good common sense, and sound judgment. Her constitution, moreover, was excellent.—While we thought that *others* might soon die, we did not feel, as we ought, the sovereign right of God to take whom he would."

Miss. Herald.

Ordinations and Installations.

Ordained at Brookline, N. H. as Pastor of the Congregational Church, Rev. JACOB HOLT. Sermon by Rev. H. Moore, of Milford.

In Amsterdam, N. Y. Mr. SETH SMALLEY; and at Madrid, N. Y. Mr. SILAS PRATT; both to the work of the gospel ministry in the Baptist Connexion.

Installed, at Peterborough, N. H. Rev. PETER HOLT, over the Presbyterian Church and Society in Peterborough and Greenfield. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Bradford, of New Boston.

Feb. 4,—Rev. RUSSELL JENNINGS was ordained as Pastor of the Baptist Church in Vernon, Con. Sermon by Rev. F. Wightman of Middletown.

Feb. 7,—Mr. LEMUEL HALL and Mr. JOSEPH FIELD were ordained Evangelists, at Parishville, St. Lawrence county, N. Y. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Hoyt, of Potsdam.

Feb. 21,—Rev. CHARLES L. COOK was ordained Pastor of the Baptist Church in Hanson, Ms. Sermon by Rev. B. C. Grafton, of Plymouth.

Feb. 21,—Rev. GEORGE R. RUDD, was ordained and installed Pastor over the Presbyterian Church in Scipio, N. Y. Sermon by Rev. Dr. Perrin, Professor in the Theological Seminary, Auburn.

Feb. 21,—Rev. WILLIAM PHILLIPS was ordained over the Baptist Church in Attleborough, Ms. Sermon by Rev. David Benedict, of Pawtucket.

Feb. 22,—Rev. JOHN BARRETT was ordained to the work of the ministry, in Mesopotamia, Trumbull Co. Ohio. Sermon by Rev. Luther Humphrey.

Feb. 28,—Rev. President HUMPHREY was installed Pastor of the College Church at Amherst, Mass.

Feb. 28,—Mr. CALEB STETSON was ordained Pastor of the Unitarian Church in Medford, Ms.

Feb. 23,—Rev. WILLIAM R. GOLD was installed as Pastor of the Congregational Church in Torrington, Con. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Hart, of Plymouth.

March 7,—Rev. WILLIAM W. HUNT was ordained Pastor of the Union Congregational Church and Society in Amherst, Ms. Sermon by Rev. Alfred Ely, of Monson.

March 7,—Rev. ORA PEARSON was ordained over the Congregational Church and Society in Kingston, N. H. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Ingraham, of Bradford, Ms.

March 21,—Rev. SAMUEL SPRING was installed Pastor of the North Ecclesiastical Church and Society in Hartford, Con. Sermon by Rev. Dr. Spring, of New-York.

THE

CHRISTIAN MAGAZINE.

VOL. IV. MAY, 1827. No. 5.

For the Christian Magazine.

SELF-EXAMINATION.

THAT Christians know themselves, is a duty plainly taught in the Holy Scriptures. On a proper discharge of that duty they are dependent, in no small degree, for that consistency of character with which their happiness, respectablity and usefulness are intimately connected. It is impossible for them to know themselves without self-examination. Hence they are frequently directed to examine themselves. To assist them in the important exercise, the following remarks are offered to their serious consideration.

Christians should appoint certain times for examining themselves. Every person who pursues his employment in a profitable manner, pursues it systematically. Men of the world, who are successful in their respective occupations, are careful to plan their work. To different kinds of business they assign different portions of time. By making and observing proper appointments, their business proceeds in a regular train —one kind does not interfere with another. If the farmer, the mechanic, the merchant, or the student, enters on business without making previous arragements and appointing different portions of time to different objects of attention, he is always hurried and always complaining of the want of time. At no time is he prepared to do what ought then to be done. And what he is actually engaged in performing, is attended to with much regret, because it ought to have been attended to at a former period. Those who conduct in such a manner are always behind, instead of being before, their work. They labor hard, and have but little satisfaction in their labor. The Christian has his duties to perform, and has time sufficient for performing them. But unless he makes his arrangements, and by previous appointments sets apart certain portions of time for certain duties, one duty will clash with another, and no one will be discharged either faithfully or profitably. As Christians have their time appointed for attending public worship and the ordinance of the Lord's Supper, so they should appoint certain times for reading the Scriptures, for family prayer, for secret prayer, and for self-examination. All these exercises are duties;—all require time; and it is exceedingly desirable that they all be performed at the time previously appointed and set apart for the purpose. Christians should be economical of their time, and by a due economy of it, every duty may be performed seasonably and profitably.

Christians should firmly resolve to examine themselves at the time previously appointed. Self-examination is a work very difficult, demanding the utmost de-

cision and perseverance. A mere wish, a vague determination to perform it is not sufficient. From a work so difficult, requiring such abstraction from the world and such intense thoughts, Christians are ready to excuse themselves, and consequently to attend to every plea that may be suggested for omitting it. But if self-examination is really a duty at the time previously designated for performing it, all reasons, and pleas, and excuses for omitting or deferring it, should then be treated as mere idle suggestions—they should be immediately repelled. Christians should view the work in its true light, regard it in all its weight and importance, and summon up all the energies of their minds to aid them in accomplishing it. Their determination to enter upon it, and to complete it, at the proper time, must be deliberate, fixed and unyielding.

In examining themselves, Christians should confine their attention wholly to themselves. And in order to this, they must entirely withdraw their minds from all external objects. It is their duty, sometimes, to attend to external objects. It is right then to withdraw their attention from themselves and fix it exclusively on objects of external sense. But it is not their duty to attend to such objects when it is their duty to attend to themselves. Therefore they must withdraw their attention completely from all such objects, when duty calls them to engage in the important work of self-examination. As the duty of examining themselves demands their undivided attention, they must, while engaged in performing it, be blind to every object of the eye, deaf to every object of the ear, and perfectly insensible to objects of every other sense. Sometimes it is their duty to attend to literary, scientific, and other interesting subjects. But when it is their duty to examine themselves, it is not their duty to attend to any such subjects. An attention to them is wholly incompatible with present duty. It requires great vigor of mind to repel every intruding thought which may be suggested by the habits of association, by our wicked hearts, and by the great adversary of souls, while we are engaged in examining ourselves. But this must be done; or, in consequence of a divided attention, the work of self-examination will be superficial and unprofitable.

Christians should proceed in examining themselves, critically and impartially. The object of the exercise is to know themselves. It is desirable that they form a correct idea, not merely of their talents and improvements, but of their hearts and lives. They should ascertain the nature of the designs which they form, the affections which they habitually cherish, and the motives from which they habitually act. They must, therefore, discriminate between holy and unholy designs, between holy and unholy affections, and between holy and unholy motives. All this is necessary in order to be critical in the examination. And unless the examination is critical, it can secure no valuable object. But what requires the greatest effort is to perform the work with impartiality. Christians while in this life are very imperfect. Partiality for self, or a desponding disposition, may warp their judgment, and lead them into error. But it is their duty and interest, when examining themselves, not

only to perceive but to acknowledge things to be just as they are. They should discern the sinful affections of their hearts, acknowledge them to be sinful, and feel towards them just as they ought to feel towards such affections in others. They should discern the benevolent affections of their hearts and acknowledge them to be benevolent and feel all that complacency in them which they ought to feel in the holy and benevolent affections of others. Let them never put light for darkness nor darkness for light, sweet for bitter nor bitter for sweet. While they discern and approve whatever is good in their hearts, let them as readily discern and condemn whatever is wrong.

Christians should examine themselves prayerfully. While employed in the exercise, they ought always to feel that they are immediately under the eye of God, and that he has a clear and perfect view of all the affections and exercises of their hearts. And though they may design to be critical and impartial in examining themselves; yet knowing the deceitfulness of their own hearts, they have no reason to be satisfied with what they do themselves in the very trying and difficult work. Hence they have alway reason for adopting the prayer of the Psalmist, "Examine me, O Lord, and prove me; try my reigns and my heart. Search me, O God, and know my heart, try me and know my thoughts, and see if there be any wicked way in me, and lead me in the way everlasting." As Christians, in the serious work of examination, desire to know what they are, it is very natural for them to feel their dependance on God for such important knowledge, and as proper to implore with holy importunity, his assistance in obtaining it. While examining themselves, they are performing a very solemn office—they are alone with God and their own hearts, sitting in judgment upon themselves for eternity. Let them fervently pray for the aid of that Being who will review all their decisions in the presence of the whole universe. SOLUS.

From the Evangelist.

WRONG VIEWS OF THE GLORY OF GOD.

IT is a common art of the advocates of error, and perhaps the one of all others which they most successfully practice, to pervert the language of scripture, and then appropriate it to their own use. Having taken a scripture phrase, and attached to it such a meaning as suits their purposes, they pass it off upon the credulous as Bible truth; and then bring to its support abundance of scripture testimony, wrested in the same way, which has the appearance, and nothing but the appearance, of giving countenance to their scheme. In this way it happens, that the advocates of error use much of the same language which is used by the friends of truth, and lead many to think that they do believe and teach a great deal of truth; so that some well meaning people, who intend to take the Bible for their guide, are led to think favorably of their sentiments in general, and to suppose that the difference between them and the friends of truth is not very essential, and it may be, to conclude, that one believes only a litle more than the other. Now, this is often the very thing the advocates of error wish peo-

ple to believe, at first, in order to gain their confidence, and prepare the way for their real sentiments to be insinuated into the mind, without creating an alarm, which might defeat their designs. And such is the view which the scripture gives us of the arts of deceivers and seducers. They are represented as *creeping* into houses, *privily* bringing in damnable heresies, using *feigned* words, creeping in *unawares*, sowing tares while men *sleep*, and practising *cunning craftiness* whereby they lie in wait to *deceive*. And Christians are warned to beware of these arts of deceivers, that they be not led away with the error of the wicked, and fall from their own steadfastness.

Such terms as *total depravity*, *regeneration*, *divine sovereignty*, *election*, and *reprobation*, commonly convey to the minds of those who have been accustomed to their use among Calvinists, an idea that the person who uses them must be, nearly, if not quite, Calvinistic in sentiment. But it is a fact, which ought to be more extensively understood than it is, that these terms are used occasionally, and some of them frequently, by men who reject, and labor unceasingly to destroy, every doctrine which Calvinists use them to express. This fact can be easily ascertained by asking any such man to explain what he means by these terms, if he will but be frank in his explanation. The term *regeneration*, for instance, is used by all who profess to believe the Bible, because it is a scripture term. One means by it a physical change, wrought in the soul by divine power, in which the creature is wholly passive, and which *enables* him to love God. Another means by it a moral change, in the affections only, wrought by divine power, but one in which the creature is active, and begins to love God. Another means, the removal of the burden of guilt, by an assurance of pardon. Another means, the removal of the fear of punishment, by embracing the doctrine that all will be saved. Another means, water baptism, by which the relations of the individual are changed, and he is brought into connexion with the visible church. Another means, that change which a heathen experiences in becoming convinced of the truth of the Christian religion. In all these senses, and perhaps more, the term *regeneration* is explained, and used, by different classes of people who call themselves Christians. It is, therefore, ascertaining nothing, as to a man's views of scripture truth, to hear him say, he believes the doctrine of regeneration. He may say this, and speak largely of the importance of this great Bible doctrine, and urge it upon his hearers, and insist upon the necessity of being born again, in order to enter the kingdom of God, and quote a multitude of passages of scripture in support of it; and after all, not let us know, unless he gives us some explanation, whether he is a Calvinist, an Arminian, an Antinomian, an Arian, a Socinian, a Swedenborgian, or a Universalist. And probably, if he has a design to deceive us, he will use such terms as we do, without a particular explanation of them; and represent the difference between him and us, as not very essential, till he gains our confidence, and prepares the way to instil his poison by degrees, in a covert manner, till the whole mass is corrupted.

The great point of distinction between the true and the false is

experimental religion, is, that true religion consists in disinterested affection, and all false religion consists in selfishness. Many of the advocates of error, however, have thought it expedient to assent to this statement, and by attaching such a sense to the terms *disinterested* and *selfish* as to accommodate them to their own views, pretend to make disinterested, universal, and impartial benevolence, the ground on which they build their whole system. With them, happiness is the only thing worthy of regard, for its own sake, and actions are esteemed good or bad, only as they tend to promote or hinder the greatest degree of happiness. And their idea of the goodness of God, is, that he places his happiness in promoting, as far as in his power, the highest happiness of his creatures. They reject the idea that holiness and sin are good and evil, in their own nature, aside from their tendency, and that holiness is more desirable than happiness, and sin more hateful than misery. And in this way, they give such a sense to the terms *disinterested* and *selfish*, as takes away the offence of the cross, and renders them agreeable to the feelings of the natural heart.

The advocates of truth have been in the habit of endeavoring to guard their hearers against trusting in any selfish experience, and of trying to teach them how to distinguish between true and false religion, whether in themselves or others. And it has, perhaps, been generally thought a sufficient guard against selfishness, to enjoin it upon their hearers to make the *glory of God* their supreme object. They have repeated the injunction of the apostle, "whether therefore ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." They have taught, that we must, in our prayers, ask God to do that which is most for his glory; that we must, in seeking our own salvation, have an ultimate and supreme regard to the glory of God in it; and that, in praying for, and seeking to promote, the salvation of others, we must have our views directed to the glory of God, as the principal thing. And they have, perhaps, generally thought, that such injunctions were a sufficient guard against that selfishness which is so natural to man.

But the great adversary is fruitful in expedients. He can transform himself into an angel of light; and it is no great thing if his ministers also can transform themselves after the same example. It is too plainly taught in the scriptures, that we must make the glory of God our supreme object, to render it prudent for the advocates of error to deny it. The great thing to be accomplished by them, in order to favour their cause, is, to find out some way of evading it, and of turning this scripture language to the advancement of their own schemes. If they can find out any method of giving a selfish turn to this phrase, and of attaching some meaning to it that is agreeable to the natural heart, they can then make as free a use of it as the friends of truth do, and gain an important advantage by it.

And this way, I think has been found out. The glory of God consists in his goodness. His natural perfections, his infinite knowledge, almighty power, and universal presence, would be objects of terror, if not under the direction of infinite goodness. The goodness of God comprehends all his moral perfections. His mer-

cy, his truth, his justice, his faithfulness, &c. are only different modifications of his goodness. Goodness is disinterested, universal, and impartial benevolence; or, in other words, it is regarding every being and every object according to its real worth.

Now, let it be taken for granted, that happiness is the greatest good; that God finds his happiness only in communicating happiness to others; that the only object he could have in making creatures, was, to exercise his goodness in communicating happiness to them; and it is easy to come to the conclusion, that, since the glory of God consists in his goodness, the highest glory of God is promoted by securing the highest happiness of his creatures, and by nothing else. This view of the glory of God is entirely agreeable to the natural temper of mankind. That temper is to seek their own happiness; and it leads them to love all those who appear to them to be desirous of securing it, and ready to do all they can to accomplish that end. And they are highly pleased, to have a being of infinite knowledge and almighty power, engaged, with all his heart, in endeavoring to secure that which they most of all desire. And if they can thus identify the glory of God with their own happiness, they are quite willing to adopt the language of scripture, and profess to do all to the glory of God, understanding it, as they do, to mean that which is inseparable from their own highest happiness. This, if I understand them, and I believe I do, is the view which Universalists take of the glory of God, and the view which Arminians take of it, and the view which many among Calvinists take of it, who, perhaps without being conscious of it, are inclined to mingle a great deal of Arminianism with what Calvinistic sentiments they embrace. The difference between Arminians and Universalists on the question whether all men will be saved, grows out of a different view of man's free agency, and the consistency of it with God's inclining the heart; and not out of any difference in their views of the glory of God. And the difference between those Universalists who hold to a limited punishment after death, and those who deny any, does not arise from any difference in their views of the glory of God. And perhaps the difference between both of these, and some professed Calvinists, arises from something else too, and not from any difference in this respect. It being taken for granted that the glory of God requires him to make all his creatures as happy as he can, some conclude that he can and will make them all happy immediately after death; others conclude that he must punish some for a season, before he can make them happy; others conclude that he does all he consistently can to make all happy, but that, through their own perverseness, their happiness is lost, contrary to his wish, and contrary to what his highest glory requires, so that there is a loss of glory to him by that means.

I spoke of this selfish view of the glory of God as having been found out, by the advocates of error. But it is not a recent discovery. I remember reading, many years ago, in a book which was thought to be Calvinistic, an account of the process of regeneration, which made the great work of the Holy Spirit to be performed upon the understanding, enlightening it to see the true character of God, upon which the

heart was represented as coming right of course. I suppose this view of the glory of God was the foundation of it. As soon as any selfish creature views God as seeking his happiness, in a way that is agreeable to him, and doing all he can to promote it, he will love him of course. The same view of it, in substance, I once obtained from a Swedenborgian book, where the atonement was represented as the same with reconciliation, and the design of Christ's coming into the world was represented to be to reconcile men to God, by bringing God so near that they could see him in his true light, when they would love him of course. An Arminian preacher told me, fourteen years ago, that he thought God was more glorified in the salvation of a sinner than he was in his destruction, because both mercy and justice appeared in his salvation, while justice alone appeared in his destruction. And I understood it to be grounded on the same view of the glory of God. He thought the justice of God sufficiently manifested in the atonement, and that if all men would consent to be saved, God would be much more glorified than he is now, while many, by withholding their consent, disappoint his wishes. It is a maxim with both classes of Universalists, that the only design of God's punishing sin, is, to do good to creatures; and hence, some of them think that all are sufficiently punished in this life to answer that end; and others think that some of the worst need a limited punishment hereafter, in order to secure the good of creatures most effectually.

That which makes all these schemes acceptable to the natural heart, is, that they all identify the glory of God with the happiness of the creature; and thus make it coincide with perfect selfishness. And the radical error in them all, is, that happiness is considered the only thing desirable for its own sake, and holiness is only considered desirable because of its tendency to happiness; whereas the truth is, that holiness is a good in itself, and a greater good than happiness, and sin is an evil in itself, and a greater evil than misery; and the highest glory of God consists in the most perfect exercise and display of all his perfections. It is plain, that his grace and mercy could have had no opportunity to be exercised and displayed, if there had not been guilty and miserable creatures, on whom to bestow favors. And it is equally plain, that his vindictive justice could have had no opportunity to be exercised or displayed, if there had been no guilty creatures to punish, according to their deserts. If the highest glory of God consists in the most perfect exercise and display of all his perfections, it is plain, then, that the highest glory of God required the existence of a world of sinners, of whom some shall be saved, and some lost; and his wisdom and sovereignty are exercised in determining how many of each, and who shall compose each class. If all should be lost, mercy would not have its perfect exercise; and if all were saved, justice would not have its perfect exercise. By the most perfect exercise of the divine perfections, is meant, such a harmonious exercise of the whole, as furnishes the most perfect gratification of the whole, and shows the beauty of the whole to the best advantage. If mercy were to be exercised in saving all, it may be that more

mercy would be exercised than is in saving a part, though I am not certain of that; but it is plain, that in that case, justice could not be exercised towards any, except for a limited time. If justice were exercised in punishing all for ever, it may be that more justice would be exercised than is in punishing a part; but, in that case, mercy could not be exercised towards any, except for a limited time. The most perfect exercise of each, is that exercise of one in harmony with another, which affords the most perfect gratification, and the most beautiful display of the whole.

I know it is said, that justice had its perfect exercise and display in the sufferings of Christ; and that it is not necessary that any should be lost, in order to the glory of that attribute. If this is true, then it follows inevitably that all must be saved; for if the glory of the divine justice does not require their destruction, the glory of the divine mercy does require their salvation; and the highest glory of God will be sacrificed, if they are not saved. Will it be said, that some must be for ever punished, in order to keep holy beings from falling? I have no doubt that is one purpose it answers; but, if that were all, and the sufferings of Christ furnished the most perfect display of vindictive justice, I should think it quite unnecessary that any should be punished for ever merely to keep others from falling. God could incline their hearts to obedience; and if they wanted motives, they might find them, in that case, in the sufferings of Christ. It is not true, however, that the sufferings of Christ did furnish any exercise of vindictive justice. Vindictive justice is exercised only in punishing the guilty. Christ was not guilty. He suffered the just for the unjust. His sufferings, voluntarily endured for sinful men, furnished a sufficient ground for the offer of mercy to them, and a sufficient security that when pardon should be bestowed upon the penitent for the sake of his atonement, none should take encouragement from that to commit sin in the hope of pardon without an atonement. But his sufferings were not the evil threatened in the law to those who transgressed. That evil was eternal death; and he did not suffer eternal death. He did not suffer the punishment which was due to sinful men; that punishment is *remitted* to such as believe in Christ. His sufferings furnished no exercise of vindictive justice, but only of public justice. By them God secured the honor of his government, and showed how he could be just to himself, while forgiving sin. Vindictive justice will have no exercise, except in the sufferings of this life, if all men are saved. Or, it will have but a temporary exercise, if some endure a limited punishment after death, and then go to heaven.

And I would ask any who adopt the opinion that the justice of God had its perfect exercise and display in the sufferings of Christ, so that it is not necessary that any should be lost in order to the glory of that attribute, why, on the same principles, it may not be concluded, that the mercy of God had its most perfect exercise and display in the sufferings of Christ, so that it is not necessary that any should be saved in order to the glory of that attribute? If, according to Arminians, God cannot incline the hearts of men, consistently with their free agency, and many by withholding

their consent to the offers of the gospel, disappoint God's wishes, what security is there, that it shall not be so with all? And if it should chance to be so with all, would it not still be true that there was mercy in the gift of Christ, and in the offer of pardon? And if it was mercy to provide a Saviour and offer pardon, why ought not that mercy to be estimated by the disposition God manifests in the offer, and the greatness of the good offered, though it be rejected? And as that mercy is infinite, why is not infinite mercy exercised and displayed in these provisions, although, after all, men should universally reject the offer, and none should ever be saved? It appears to me that this reasoning has a much better foundation than that which relates to the display of the divine justice in the sufferings of Christ; for here the same attribute is really exercised, that is, in the salvation of a sinner; while in the other case, it is not the same, it being public justice, and not vindictive justice. Mercy is also exercised in sparing sinners from day to day, and in bestowing favors upon them while here; and it would have a temporary exercise after death, if some men were taken to heaven for a time, long enough to reward them for all their acts of obedience, and should then be sent to hell, to suffer the punishment they deserve.

If we look at the sufferings of Christ, then, and the consequent offer of pardon, there is, at least, as much ground to say, that they furnished the most perfect exercise and display of mercy, as of justice; and I think much more ground to say it. And if we look at them merely, we have as much reason to believe that all will be lost, as that all will be saved. And if we look at the mercy and the justice displayed in the enjoyments and sufferings of guilty men in this life, there is, at least, as much mercy exercised as there is justice; and from them alone we have as much reason to infer universal damnation as universal salvation. And if we look at the exercise of mercy and justice beyond the grave, we have as much reason to expect that some will go to heaven for a limited time, and then be sent to hell, as we have to expect that some will be sent to hell for a limited time, and then be taken to heaven. And if we look at the mercy displayed in the atonement, and offer of pardon, and consider how great a portion of the punishment which the sinner will endure will be for rejecting that mercy, and how the value of that mercy will be shown by the punishment which will be inflicted for rejecting it, there will appear to be, at least, as much ground for saying, that both mercy and justice are glorified in the destruction of a sinner, as there is for saying, that both mercy and justice are glorified in his salvation.

But, it may still be asked, whether God is not more glorified in the salvation of a sinner, than he is in his destruction? If the meaning of this question is, whether God is not more glorified in the salvation of Paul, than he would have been in his destruction; I answer, yes: and the only reason I have to think so, is, that God has actually saved him; and I believe he always does that which is most for his glory. And, on the same ground, I should affirm, that God is more glorified

in the destruction of Judas, than he would have been in his salvation, because he has actually destroyed him. If the meaning is, whether God is not more glorified in the salvation of Paul, than he is in the destruction of Judas, I answer, I cannot tell; I have no means of knowing. It depends upon the degree of mercy exercised in saving the one, and the degree of justice exercised in punishing the other. And that depends on the degree of guilt which is pardoned in the one case, and punished in the other; and that depends on the relative capacities and opportunities and advantages of the two men, concerning which my information is too defective to warrant an opinion. If the meaning is, whether God is not more glorified in the salvation of one, than he is in the destruction of another, whose degree of guilt is the same, and whose capacities for enjoyment and suffering are the same; I cannot tell; and I can think of no use it would be to me to know, if I could. Were I disposed to form an opinion from the scanty view I can obtain of the subject, I should be inclined to think he must be more glorified in the one he destroys, in order to have a sufficient motive for destroying him. For, if the degrees of glory to God were equal, and the effect upon other creatures were equal, the good of the individual would turn the scale in favor of his salvation. But, I cannot tell whether any such case ever occurs. If the meaning is, whether, if we take an individual sinner who is now alive, and unconverted, we have not reason to believe that God would be more glorified in saving, than he would be in destroying him; I answer, no; we have no reason to believe so. For, if we had, we should have the same reason to believe that God will save him; since he will certainly do that which is most for his glory: and we have no information beforehand, with respect to the sinners around us, which it is most for his glory to save, and which it is most for his glory to destroy.

It may still be asked, how God can be glorified in the destruction of a sinner? The answer has been substantially given already. The highest glory of God requires the most perfect exercise of his justice, as well as of his mercy? Justice is as essential an attribute of God, as mercy is; and it is too much for sinful creatures to say, that it is not in itself as glorious an attribute, and that it is not as desirable that it should have its perfect exercise. Indeed, I can see no reason why any should think it less glorious than mercy, unless it is because they are selfish creatures, and regard their own happiness more than the glory of God. It is perfectly natural, that such should be particularly displeased with that part of the divine character, which they fear will require the sacrifice of all that they value. But holy beings *must* love the vindictive justice of God. None can be holy, who do not. It must appear an amiable attribute in their eyes. For it is the very nature of holiness to hate sin. And the punishments which God inflicts upon the wicked, in the exercise of his vindictive justice, are nothing but the proper tokens of his disapprobation of them for their wicked conduct. If there were but one creature in the universe, and he a sinner, it would be inseparable from the holy nature of God to disapprove of that sin-

ful creature; and the honor of God would require, that he should let that creature know his disapprobation, by proper tokens, that he might not vainly think God was altogether such an one as himself. If holiness is beautiful, then hatred of sin is equally beautiful; and it is beautiful to have it manifested by proper tokens; and all who love holiness must desire to see it done. And as long as holiness shall appear beautiful, in the eyes of the holy inhabitants of heaven, it will appear desirable to them to have God continue the tokens of his disapprobation of sin, by the everlasting exercise of his vindictive justice upon the workers of iniquity. And it ought not to be forgotten, that the value which God puts upon the mercy of the gospel, which sinners reject, will be clearly seen in the punishment which they endure for that rejection. Nor ought it to be overlooked that there is another good end which will be answered by the everlasting punishment of the wicked. It is difficult to conceive how the greatness of the grace and mercy of God towards them that are saved should be seen, in the clearest light, without a living example before the eyes of all intelligent beings of what they deserved, and from what divine grace and mercy have delivered them. The endless punishment of the wicked will furnish such an example. And while all holy beings shall go forth, and look upon the carcasses of the men that have transgressed against the Lord, while their worm dieth not, and their fire is not quenched, and they are an abhorring unto all good beings, they will return with higher views of the grace of God towards the redeemed, and be prepared to sing with higher notes the wonders of redeeming love.

If these observations should help any to see, that the glory of God requires the destruction of some, as really as it does the salvation of others, and guard them against that representation of the glory of God which is the high road to Universalism, and which has been evidently contrived to suit the selfish feelings of the wicked, the object of my labor will be attained.

CALVIN.

For the Christian Magazine.

REMARKS UPON "INDISCRETION IN THE PULPIT," AND "DANGEROUS CONSEQUENCES OF OVER-STATEMENTS."

Messrs. Editors,—Will you allow me to make a few remarks upon two pieces in your Magazine for February, with the titles given above. The general remark, which I have to make respecting the piece entitled "*Indiscretion in the Pulpit*," is, that it is very *indiscreetly* written. I cannot say, that it does not contain many very timely and important truths, nor that there is much in it, which is absolutely false. But this I do say, and I shall attempt to make it appear, that many of the observations of the writer, if not themselves false, are so illustrated as to make a decidedly false and dangerous impression. I shall confine my remarks to three of his general observations.

1. "*Preachers are indiscreet who practise upon theories adopted without sufficient examination.*" This is a declaration which, I presume, no sober man ever doubted; and which might have been illustra-

ted, so as to have made a deep and salutary impression upon your readers, without the trouble of "transferring any of them across the Atlantic, to North Britain, or to past ages;" or, without using one half of the blazing figures, and extravagant expressions with which his communication abounds. But I have nothing to do with the *style* of this writer. My objection is to the representation of the principles and conduct of those who are supposed "to practise upon theories adopted without sufficient examination." After having introduced to our notice a celebrated character, whose novel principles "are adopted by many imitators," he says, "One of them, for instance is, that '*all sinners are alike, and must therefore be treated alike.*' As a consequence, no regard is paid to age, circumstances, or education. All sinners alike! True, there are points, in which, the simpleton resembles the philosopher; the speechless infant, the man of grey hairs. But suppose it, therefore, to be adopted as a principle, that the same language must be spoken, to the young, and the old, the beggar, and the noble. The theory cannot sustain a moment's scrutiny. It has appendages however. It is found, in one case, that conviction is produced by exciting the angry passions; that depravity is diclosed, by calling it forth, in the most violent indignation; and what follows? This mode of convicting sinners is adopted as a universal principle."

Now, Messrs. Editors, this appears to me like an "*overstatement*," which betrays great "*indiscretion.*" For in the *first* place, some of the principles which the writer condemns are not such as are adopted without sufficient examination. The principle for instance, "*that all sinners are alike*," understood as it is by those who use this phraseology, and, indeed, by those generally who *hear* it used, is not a false principle, but a fundamental doctrine of the Gospel. They are all alike "dead in trespasses and sins." "As face answereth to face in water, so the heart of man to man." Nor is it a false principle that all sinners are to be, in *some* respects, treated alike, and no body ever yet supposed, that they were to be treated alike in *all* respects. They are to be treated alike, in those respects, in which they *are* alike. As they are all alike "dead in trespasses and sins," they are all to be plainly told that this is their state, and all exhorted to repent and believe the Gospel, and all assured that unless they do these things, they cannot be saved. If the writer does not mean, by those who teach that all sinners are alike, those who hold that they are alike, and are to be treated alike, in the particular respects abovementioned, he is very unfortunate, not to say "*indiscreet*," in the use of his language; for as this is the only class that think or say, that all sinners are alike, his readers must of course understand him to mean these. And if he does mean these, he reproaches those with adopting theories without sufficient examination, who are preaching the plain truths of the Gospel.

In the *second* place, the *consequences* which he names, do not follow from the principles adopted. After having named the principle adopted by some, that "*all sinners are alike*," and must, therefore, be treated alike, he

adds, "As a consequence no regard is paid to age, circumstances, or education. All sinners are alike! True, there are points in which the simpleton resembles the philosopher; the speechless infant, the man of grey hairs. But suppose it, therefore, to be adopted as a principle, that the same language must be spoken to the young, and to the old, the beggar, and the noble. The theory cannot sustain a moment's scrutiny." But I ask, is it true that those who believe that all sinners are alike "dead in trespasses and sins," and are all to be told that this is their condition, and all exhorted to repent and believe the Gospel, and all assured that unless they do these things, they cannot be saved, pay "no regard to age, circumstances, or education?" Do they use the same language in addressing "the young, and the old, the beggar, and the noble?" I need only ask these questions. Every well informed reader knows that they must be answered in the negative. If among this class, there have been instances in which due respect has not been paid to age and rank, it is nothing more than is true of every other class of men. And for an individual to cast the reproach of an indiscretion, committed by a few, upon the whole class to which they belong, is not merely an "indiscretion,"—"it is an overstatement," or in plainer language still, it is a slander.

In the above quotation, the writer says, "It is found, in one case, that conviction is produced by exciting the angry passions; that depravity is disclosed by calling it forth, in the most violent indignation; and what follows? *This mode of convicting sinners, is adopted as an* UNIVERSAL PRINCIPLE!!" If this writer has known an *individual* who has attempted "to produce conviction by exciting the angry passions," he cannot have known many who have done it. But whether he have known many or few, to say that this is adopted as a universal principle by those who believe, that all sinners are alike, is an "*indiscretion*" fully equal to any which he condemns. Had he been declaiming in a fourth of July oration, or writing a warm political essay, such exaggeration might have admitted of an apology; but in a religious communication, designed as a caution against indiscretions in the pulpit, it is intolerable.

2. *It is indiscreet to adopt the controversial method of preaching.*" Here the reader will notice that the controversial method of preaching is condemned without qualification. But it seems that the writer was aware that he could not easily sustain so broad an assertion against the known precepts and practise of the Apostles; and in his illustration condemns only the practise of preaching so as to evince "a *delight* in the spirit of controversy." The first sentence after the assertion above stated is the following. "It is *always* important to contend earnestly for the faith, and *sometimes* to declare open war with its opposers; but even this may be accomplished, without evincing a *delight* in the spirit of controversy." And all which he afterwards says, under this head, appears designed to show, that ministers ought not to contend for the sake of contending, or with a spirit which *delights* in controversy. Now all this is readily admitted to be true, and important; but the writer ought to have known, that it does

nothing toward sustaining his general proposition. This is, "It is indiscreet to adopt the controversial method of preaching." But cannot the controversial method of preaching be adopted, when occasion requires, without evincing a "*delight*" in controversy? Cannot a preacher of the Gospel, in imitation of Paul, state the errors which are prevailing, and refute them, and appear not to delight "in prostrating an adversary," but in vindicating the cause of truth? Can he not state and refute *real* errors, without creating imaginary differences by means "of paradoxical expressions," and misrepresentation? And in this way, may not the minds of his hearers be fixed in truth, instead of error, "as lasting as their earthly existence, and which shall be perpetuated by future generations?" If the controversial method of preaching, is not to be adopted, how, I ask, can a minister of the Gospel "*contend* earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints?" There is no contention in merely preaching the truth, without opposing error; and there is no contention in reasoning in support of truth, if it be so managed as not to have any designed or perceptible bearing upon the errors of an opponent. To pretend to preach the Gospel faithfully, at all times and places, without controversy, is to pretend "to be wise above what is written," and actually to attempt what has been a thousand times proved to be an impossibility. I do not wish to see a minister of the Gospel always aiming directly at his opponents in his sermons. Much less do I wish ever to see him actuated, by the love of controversy. But I do love to see him always *ready*, as well as able, to maintain the truth against the objections of its adversaries, and, if possible, "to stop the mouths of gainsayers." Such a practise is authorized, not only by the precepts of Scripture, but by the example of all the prophets, and apostles, and I may add, of all the ministers of the Gospel in every age, who have been distinguished for their success in propagating truth, and arresting the progress of error.

The assertion of your correspondent that "it is indiscreet to adopt the controversial method of preaching," is very *untimely*. If there are times when "it is indiscreet to adopt the controversial method of preaching," it certainly is not wise to say much about this in public, at a time when ministers are generally erring on the other hand. Now "the controversial method of preaching," is not the fault of the present day. On the contrary, where there is one that errs in this respect, there are five that preach in so loose, and general a manner, as to leave multitudes in doubt, whether they agree with, or differ from, their opponents. The times now require, that the war should be carried to the enemy's camp. The advocates of error have taken refuge in lies, and entrenched themselves in strong holds. It is necessary for the friends of truth now to act on the offensive as well as defensive, and with a boldness and determination which is seen to be resistless, to attack their refuges of lies, and drive them from their strong holds. If they would arise as one man, and gird on the sword of the spirit, and wield it dexterously, and with a becoming valour, the enemies of the truth would be driven from the field. It is not

because the enemies of the truth, have more talents, or learning, or a better cause, than its friends, that they have, in many instances, met with greater success. One important reason is, they have made more direct, and courageous *attacks*. And I verily believe, that one of the greatest obstacles which now lies in the way of the progress and complete triumph of truth is, the loose and indefinite manner in which it is frequently preached, and the timid, indirect, and consequently inefficient method of opposing error. I do not wish to intimate that it is best for ministers *always*, or even *generally*, to adopt the "controversial method of preaching." But there are occasions when this method is clearly the *best* method, when no other is so scriptural, so judicious, or so effectual to the accomplishment of the grand purposes of preaching. For my own part, I would have ministers of the Gospel always on the watch, wise to discern the signs of the times, and ready not only to state and inculcate the doctrines of the Gospel upon those who believe them, but to meet the objections, and to expose the sophistry of those who are attempting to subvert the Gospel of Christ. With that mouth and wisdom, which Christ has, in many instances, actually given, there might be a defence of the Gospel made, which "no adversary could gainsay or resist." The mouths of many proud and vain talkers, which are now perpetually open to the subversion of whole houses, and to the great detriment of the cause of truth, might be stopped, if the ministers of the Gospel would, as occasion requires, "rebuke them sharply," and make "their folly manifest unto all men." In too many instances, they begin and persevere in their attempts to cast the reproach of falsehood and absurdity on the doctrines of the cross, because they fear no detection, or rebuke.

3. "*It is equally indiscreet to adopt the denouncing method.*" True, if this were to be adopted as an invariable method; and the same might be said respecting any other method. But there are unquestionably principles and characters, which are to be denounced, and there are times when the ministers of the Gospel are called upon to discharge this unpleasant, though important duty. Your correspondent seems to proceed in the illustration of the above general observation, upon the supposition that ministers, when they denounce a sentiment or character, must do it "without evincing their guilt," and even "*seem* to breathe malignity." But this is an error exactly similar to the one he run into in his attempts to illustrate the last observation on which I have remarked. There he seems to consider all who adopt the "controversial method," as *delighting* in controversy; but as the controversial method may be adopted without delighting in controversy, so the denouncing method, if by this be meant the actual denunciators of a principle or character, may be adopted without either "breathing malignity," or seeming "to breathe malignity." It does not necessarily follow from the fact, that a minister of the Gospel denounces certain characters, that he does this "without evincing their guilt," or uses "mere epithets of terror," without "disclosing the decisions of the divine law." Bringing clearly to view the threatenings of the divine law

and those of the Gospel, and specifying the characters to whom they apply, is what the world generally mean by denunciation in the pulpit. Now your correspondent admits that this is a duty, while he says in general terms that "it is indiscreet to adopt the denouncing method." He says one thing in his general propositions, and proves another in his illustration of them. He says, in general terms, that "it is indiscreet to adopt the controversial method of preaching," and proves that it is a great evil "to evince a *delight* in controversy." He says, "it is indiscreet to adopt the denouncing method," and proves that "to breathe malignity," and to use "mere epithets of terror," without "disclosing the decision of the divine law," is calculated to dishonour the ministerial office. Now this I call "*indiscretion*," because it is calculated to make an impression upon his readers, that all controversy and denunciation in the pulpit, is the same essentially with the evils here associated with them. Had he said simply, what, perhaps, was all he meant, that it is indiscreet to manifest a contentious spirit, or the love of controversy in the pulpit, and that it is indiscreet to "breathe malignity," when called to denounce false principles, and sinful characters, his readers would doubtless have readily assented to the truth of his assertions, and been much instructed by his communication.

"*Dangerous consequences of over-statements.*"

My first remark upon this communication of Itinerator is, it has the *appearance* of being itself an "*overstatement.*" I know not, indeed, but every word of it is true. But I must say that I could not read it without thinking that a little *coloring* was used. And I now appeal to your readers, whether there is not internal marks of exaggeration, too plain to be overlooked. The narration given is the following. "I was lately conversing with an aged man, who had been many years a professor of religion, respecting the evidence he enjoyed of his piety. His remarks were nearly to the following purport. I know that the natural heart is opposed to all the happiness of creatures, that it delights in their misery, and had it the power, would make every one of them to suffer eternally, and to the utmost of its power. I know too, that the carnal mind is at such enmity against God, that had it an arm long enough, and strong enough, it would sweep him from his throne, and make the created and uncreated beings around it, to constitute a universe of utmost agony. Now I know that I have enemies, and they are powerful. And I have been much employed in examining my own heart, to ascertain what I would do with them, were it consistent that God should commit the disposal of them entirely to my hands. And I really feel that were it consistent for them to be happy, I could not find it in my heart to consign one of them to eternal misery; and were it consistent, I would even make the Prince of darkness as happy as an arch-angel. I trust therefore that I have something of the spirit of benevolence, or true holiness in my heart."

I mean not to charge Itinerator with any intentional misrepresentation in this narrative. But I do believe that he has, under the influence of strong feelings, fallen into precisely the same error

which it is the object of his communication to condemn. At any rate, there is so much *appearance* of this, that I cannot hesitate to say, that sound "*discretion*" would have kept him from offering it to the public. No individual would attempt to caricature his own sentiments. But the statement made by your correspondent is a perfect caricature of the Orthodox doctrine of total depravity. I can, therefore, more easily believe that the coloring was given by him, than the aged man whom he represents. But be the fault of this coloring where it may, the communication is "indiscreet," because

2. It is exactly suited to bring the doctrine of total depravity into contempt. It is well known that those who hold to the doctrine of total depravity, believe that there is no evil deed which sinners under its influence will not perform, and if they are left entirely without restraint, and exposed to the requisite temptation: that is, if they are in circumstances which place the performance of the contemplated action in their power, and make it appear the necessary means of promoting their individual good. It is the acknowledged nature of selfishness to hate, and destroy every object which is seen to be in the way of its gratification. "Sin rejects God as an object of affection and sets up a separate, and opposite, and unworthy interest. The temper of sin, and the temper of God are opposite. The plans of sin, and the plans of God are opposite. If the purposes of sin go into operation, the purposes of God are defeated. If sin succeeds, the kingdom of God fails. And that sin does not succeed is owing to nothing but want of power and skill. If its malignant nature, as it exists in men and devils, could be fully expressed in action, it would dethrone the God of heaven, abolish his law, overturn his government, extinguish the joy of God and of the universe, and fill the mighty void with everlasting woe. Such is the selfish, malignant enmity to God, which reigns in the hearts of the children of disobedience. Such by nature is that carnal mind which is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. Nothing but its own imbecility prevents it from being an evil as great, in fact as it is in nature and tendency."* Now your readers cannot but perceive, that the view here given of human depravity, which I believe accords with the views of all who hold that mankind are by nature *totally* selfish, is the same which the aged man, mentioned by your correspondent, *believed*, and *intended* to express. His *language*, as represented by your correspondent, is indeed unguarded, needs qualification, and is on the whole very exceptionable. But it is no uncommon thing for persons, especially those who are illiterate, to use exceptionable language, when their views are essentially correct. Now your correspondent has treated the subject in such a way, as to condemn the *views* of depravity, entertained by the subject of his narration, as well as the *language* in which it is expressed. The impression which this communication is calculated to make upon your readers is, that this man's *sentiments* upon the subject of depravity were essentially wrong; for he immediately connects with the above narration *consequences* which he could

* Dr. Beecher's Sermon. Government of God Desirable.

not himself suppose would result merely from a faulty manner of expression, but, if from any thing which he had stated, from false *sentiments*. These consequences are indifference to the subject of Christian example, and coldness in regard to the importance of prayer, consequences which, as every one will readily perceive, are never the effects of a merely faulty manner of expression when the sentiments are correct, but which if they result from any thing here stated, must be from false *sentiments*. "I tried," says your correspondent, "to urge upon him the importance of such a Christian example as would evince that there is something in religion above the attainment of mere human nature; such an exhibition of a heavenly spirit, in his daily intercourse with the world, as would take away, and destroy, the plea of infidelity, that there can be no reality in religion, because 'there is no difference' between professors and others. But when this was urged as the necessary fruit of true benevolence, a sincere desire for the happiness of sinners, no impression could be made. This was turned off very lightly —and an effort to urge the importance of a spirit of prayer was attended with no better success."

Now as many of the public will perceive no essential difference between the views of depravity which this old man *attempted* to express, and those which are known to be entertained by the Orthodox generally, what is here said as the consequences of such views will of course be considered as their legitimate effects. But a more false and dangerous impression could scarcely be made. If your correspondent had intended, to reproach the doctrine of total depravity, he could scarcely have done it more effectually, than to make such a statement as he has to the public. There is no more effectual method of reproaching a doctrine than by giving to the public the partial and unqualified statements of it, which are often made by ignorant men, who are known to believe it, and leaving them unaccompanied with any remarks to show the difference between the simple truth and these unqualified statements. All this your correspondent has done, even upon the supposition, that the caricature drawn is not his own. Another method of bringing a doctrine into contempt is, to represent certain evil consequences as following the belief of it, when in reality, they have no necessary connexion with it. This your correspondent has done. He has connected the religious indifference, and apparent self-deception of this aged man with his views of depravity, so as to make an impression that the former are the consequences of the latter. He has not only presented the doctrine of total depravity before the public in caricature, but he has attached to it consequences suited to reproach it, which have no necessary connexion with it. Be it so, that this aged man was indifferent to all practical religion: be it so, that he was self-deceived; all this might have happened, if his views of depravity had been totally different. There are many of this description who deny the doctrine of total depravity in every shape.

A CONSTANT READER.

APHORISMS.

Merit is often an obstacle to promotion, both in church and

state. And the reason is, because it always produces bad effects—envy and fear; envy in those who cannot rise to the same degree of perfection, and fear in those who are established, and who dread, that by advancing a man of more ability and merit than themselves, they may be supplanted.

Outward comforts are like the rotten twigs of a tree—they may be touched, but if they are trusted to, or rested upon, they will certainly deceive and fail us.

Review.

For the Christian Magazine.

REVIEW OF TRACTS *published by the American Unitarian Association.*

IN the former part of Exodus, we have an account of the *miracles*, which Moses and Aaron were commissioned to perform in the presence of Pharaoh, and in several instances, immediately following the record of the miracle, it is added, that the magicians of Egypt did the same things, or attempted to do them, "with their enchantments." We have often thought of this part of the sacred history, in connexion with the manner in which Unitarians are imitating, or are endeavoring to imitate, the various religious operations of the Orthodox. Time was, when they were the avowed enemies of *Foreign Missions*. They pitied; they derided; they disbelieved, and opposed. But now, they have become the advocates of Foreign Missions, and are endeavoring to establish a mission of their own. Once, they were opposed to *Sabbath Schools*—so much so, indeed, that (unless we are greatly misinformed) an attempt was made by leading Unitarians in Boston, to prevent the Schools from assembling in the public school-rooms of the city. But now, their views, or their plans, are so much altered, that they not only have Sabbath schools among themselves, but are forming *societies* for their encourgement and benefit.* In years past, they have uniformly set themselves in opposition to *creeds*. "The *Bible*, the *Bible*, is the only rule of faith. No creed but the Bible was ever needed, or ought ever to be tolerated." But strange to tell, we have, within these few months, read several distinct *Unitarian Creeds*—each differing as much from the other, as we think they all do from the views of the inspired writers.† Remarks of this nature might be extended to *revivals of religion* (for some Unitarians begin to think very favorably even of revivals)—to special religious meetings during the week—and to evening lectures on the Sabbath. But we hasten to those particular points which are more nearly connected with our present object. Among the very persons, who have been distres-

* See Chris. Reg. for March 3, 1827.
† Ibid.

sed and alarmed that other denominations of Christians should associate, in large bodies, for the purpose of supporting and spreading what they conceived to be truth, we now witness an AMERICAN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION. And the same class of men who, in other circumstances, have had so many doubts and apprehensions, as to the propriety or expediency of publishing religious books, for cheap or gratuitous circulation, are now engaged in circulating what they call "*doctrinal Tracts*,"—"such as contain an exposition or defence of Unitarian Christianity."

Perhaps it may be thought, from the changes which have taken place in the views or plans of Unitarians, that they are becoming very much better, and may be verging towards the principles, as well as the religious operations of the Orthodox. But this conclusion is refuted by two considerations. First, in the changes that have taken place, Unitarians are but accommodating the once proscribed plans of the Orthodox, to the purpose of advancing their own views. The Foreign Missions which they advocate and support must be Unitarian missions; the Sabbath Schools must be Unitarian schools; the revivals of religion must be Unitarian revivals—events, by the way, which nobody, we believe, has ever yet had the privilege of witnessing; and all their various operations must be of a high Unitarian character. And in the second place, there is too much reason to fear, that some of their plans of operation were commenced, with a view, chiefly, to *counteract* the plans of the Orthodox. In seasons of revival, in certain places, we have heard of meetings, which their promoters were not ashamed to call "*counteracting* meetings;" and it is not improbable that, with equal appropriateness, particular societies might be denominated counteracting societies; and particular Sabbath schools counteracting schools. Unitarians see the Christian world in motion, and they feel the necessity of doing something themselves. "While other denominations are so much engaged, what will be thought of *us*, if we remain inactive? And besides, if we do not constitute societies and funds, to retain the resources of our friends among ourselves, they will be given away to others. And not improbably our friends themselves may, in some instances, be induced to leave us."—That we do no injustice to Unitarians, in imputing to them feelings and motives such as these, will appear from the following public statement of reasons, which led to the formation of the American Unitarian Association. "Living," say they, "in an age of *unusual religious excitement*, surrounded by *numerous sects, all of which are zealously employed in disseminating their peculiar tenets*, we should be wanting in duty to ourselves, and be doing injustice to the doctrines we profess, if we should allow them to fail, in exercising their due influence, for the want of a corresponding zeal and interest. Our exertions," hitherto, "have not been apparent, because insulated; and *the contributions of many of our friends have been thrown into the treasuries of other denominations*, from the want of some proper objects among ourselves, upon which they could be bestowed." (See first Annual Report, &c. p. 15.)

The American Unitarian Association was formed in the spring

or summer of 1825; and on the 30th of June, 1826, its first anniversary was celebrated in Boston. Among other means of promoting its object, the Association has commenced the publication of a series of Tracts. Ten have been already issued, with the following titles, ranged, we believe, in the order intended by the publishers. "*The faith once delivered to the Saints;*" "*One Hundred Scriptural Arguments for the Unitarian Faith;*" "*On Human Depravity, by Edmund Q. Sewall;*" "*Omniscience the Attribute of the Father only, by Rev. Joseph Hutton;*" "*On the Religious Phraseology of the New Testament, and of the present Day;*" "*A Letter on the Principles of the Missionary Enterprize;*" "*The Unitarian's Answer, by Rev. Orville Dewey;*" "*A Discourse on the Evidences of Revealed Religion, by William E. Channing, D. D.;*" "*Causes of the Progress of Liberal Christianity in New England;*" and "*Remarks on a Popular Error respecting the Lord's Supper, by F. W. P. Greenwood.*" In addition to these, "*the First Annual Report of the Executive Committee of the Association,*" is published and circulated as a Tract; and to *this* we shall here, for a moment, direct the attention of our readers.

The object of the American Unitarian Association, as expressed in the constitution, is, "to diffuse the knowledge, and promote the interests of pure," (that is, *Unitarian*) "Christianity, throughout our country." Accordingly, "*Unitarian* Christians throughout the United States are invited to unite and co-operate with it." With the exception of this exclusive, or *sectarian* feature, the constitution is not materially unlike those of religious associations among the Orthodox. The amount contributed in the first year,* although "*larger,*" as the Committee inform us, "than has ever before been collected, in the same space of time, by any *Unitarian Society,*" is not, we should think, so great, as to be very encouraging to the friends of the Association, or appalling to others—not so great, as is yearly contributed in some single parishes among the Orthodox, for the promotion of a single object of religious charity.

The most remarkable assertion in this Report of the Committee is, that the object of the American Unitarian Association is not "to *build up a party;*" and that its promoters "*care not for adding to the number of those* who merely call themselves *Unitarians*; but their wish is to increase the number of those who are *Christians* from examination and conviction." (p 24.) If this is true, is it not very strange, that none but "*Unitarian* Christians are invited to unite and co-operate with the Association—that none but *Unitarian* societies and ministers, have been assisted from its funds—and that the Tracts, which the Committee are desirous to publish, and which (with perhaps a single exception) they have published, are such as "contain an exposition or defence of *Unitarian* Christianity? Is it not strange, that a correspondence has been opened in Europe with *Unitarians* merely; and that agents have been employed to explore our own country, not to seek out the spiritual wastes, but to find and encourage *Unitarians?* In short, there never was an institution more openly sectarian, in all its movements and operations,

* $1272,72.

than this American Unitaritan Association. Its object plainly is, not so much to make Christians, as to make Unitarians—not so much to disseminate and establish the Christian faith, as to promote private sectarian views. And it is ridiculous for its Committee to say, in face of all their doings, that their design is not "to build up a party;" and that they "care not for adding to the number of those who call themselves Unitarians," so much as "to increase the number of those who are Christians, from examination and conviction."

It is evident from this Report, as well as from various other sources, that a connexion is sought by the Unitarians of Massachusetts, with the *Christ*-ians of the Southern and Western States.* We know not but this connexion will actually take place, and, so far as we are personally concerned, we care not. We have as little sympathy with one of these denominations, as we have with the other. But sure we are, that before the union is consummated, there must be great alterations in one or the other of the parties; or the mixture must be of a very singular character. At present, we could as well conceive of fire and water harmoniously commingling; or of the torrid and frigid zones' sharing common climate, and yielding common productions, as of an agreeable and harmonious union between the bawling, illiterate, self-denominated *Christ*-ians, and the cool and speculating Unitarian gentry of Boston and Cambridge.

The first Tract in the series under consideration is entitled, "*The Faith once delivered to the Saints.*" It is written sermon-wise, and doubtless was originally a sermon from the third verse of the Epistle of Jude. It is a genuine specimen of attempting by enchantment what Moses accomplished with his rod; or, in other words, it is a Unitarian imitation of the celebrated sermon of Dr. Beecher from the same text, and was published, we have no doubt, with a view to detract from the influence of that sermon. The author first gives us his own views of "the faith once delivered to the saints;" and then offers reasons derived, not from a direct recurrence to the Scriptures themselves, but from collateral considerations, to show that his system is indeed that of the inspired writers. In the view which he gives us of "the faith once delivered to the saints," we have one of those singular productions, a *Unitarian creed.* To this creed, the more importance is to be attached, as it comes, not from an individual merely, but in a sense from the whole Unitarian body, and may be regarded as a concise expression of their sentiments. In its "more naked and compact form," it is as follows:

We believe "that there is one God over all—that Jesus is the Son of God, the predicted Messiah—that man is placed here in a state of probation—that the Gospel is the final dispensation of religion—originating in the compassion of God for his sinful offspring, and founded in the placability of his nature—having for its object to make men holy, that they may be happy—establishing, as the terms of pardon and acceptance, faith, repentance of sin, and obedience of life—using for its means the labors, instructions, and institutions of Jesus Christ—and asserting

* "The Committee have watched, with peculiar interest, the growth of the *Christ*-ian connexion, which is daily becoming more numerous and respectable. From members of that body, they have received expressions of fraternal regard; and although there should not be a more intimate union between these disciples and ourselves, than now exists, yet we rejoice that they have the same great work at heart." Report, p. 10.

the sanctions of a future state of retribution." p. 6.

In remarking upon this creed, we should object, not so much to what it contains, especially if we might be allowed to put our own construction upon the words, as to what it does not contain. We are under as much obligation to receive *all* divine truth, as we are any; and (if called to be teachers) to declare the *whole* counsel of God, as we are to publish any part of it. "*All* Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is" *all* "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness;" and to take detached portions of the system of revealed truth, and endeavor to pass them off as comprising the whole, is scarcely less treason to our Lord and Master, than to publish those things as truth, which are manifestly false. Suppose a person comes forward with these two articles—"There is one God over all, and Jesus Christ is the predicted Messiah;" would it be sufficient to entitle him to Christian confidence, that a sense could be put upon his words, in which they were acknowledged on all hands to be true? Should we not wish to know farther, whether these articles comprised *all* the truth which he gathered from his Bible? Suppose, then, that he should add to them the two following articles—"Man is placed here in a state of probation, but will enter at death on a state of retribution;" would not the same inquiry still remain? 'Undoubtedly what you have said is true; but is this *all* the truth? Is this *all* that your Bible teaches you, and *all* that your Lord commissions you to teach?'

We would not be understood as expressing our full assent to every thing *contained* in the above Unitarian creed, taking the words in their most obvious sense; but we do protest against passing off such a kind of detachment from the articles of religious truth—so expressed too as to mean almost any thing, or nothing—as the grand system which Christ came from heaven to reveal. Here, it will be seen, is nothing explicit concerning the moral perfections of God—nothing of his purposes—nothing of the revealed mode of his existence, as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost—nothing of the inspiration of the sacred Scriptures—nothing of the natively sinful and lost state of man—nothing of the atonement—nothing of the necessity of regeneration by the influence of the Holy Spirit—nothing of justification by faith alone—nothing of the perseverance of the saints—nothing of the eternal punishment of those who persist in sin—and, in short, little or nothing of any of those great truths, which constitute the distinguishing glory of the Gospel. And yet we are told that the creed above given comprises "the *substance* of the faith once delivered to the saints"—"those general and *fundamental traits*, which constitute it what it is, and which cannot be removed or denied, without affecting its essential character."

We proceed now to examine the *arguments* adduced by the writer of the Tract, to show that his system of faith is indeed that of the inspired writers. The *first* is derived from "the *plainness* and *intelligibleness* of this system." It is characterized by greater *simplicity* than that of the Orthodox.—Admitting the truth of what is here stated, the two

following questions will arise: first, is the simplicity of any religious system sufficient evidence of its truth? And second, do the Scriptures represent the Christian system as one of pre-eminent simplicity? But neither of these questions, we are confident, can be answered in the affirmative. Of all systems claiming to be called religious, that of pure *Deism* is perhaps the most simple. But is this a sufficient reason for regarding it as true? Or if we could suppose a Christian, whose creed should contain but the two following articles—"There is one God, and Jesus Christ is the promised Messiah;" his system would be sufficiently simple; but would this prove that it contained all necessary truth?—And, if we are not greatly deceived, the inspired writers do not represent the Christian system, as one of pre-eminent simplicity. The apostle indeed expressed a fear to his Corinthian brethren, lest the false and judaizing teachers should corrupt them "from the simplicity that is in Christ." In other words, he feared, lest these false teachers would draw them away from their *simple dependance* upon Christ for pardon and salvation, and lead them to trust in the abolished ceremonies of the Jewish law. But this passage (so often in the mouths of Unitarians) goes not a step towards proving that the Christian system, taken as a whole, is one of great simplicity. And there are many passages, we think, which represent the contrary. "Great is the *mystery* of godliness." "*Which things* the *angels* desire to look into." "God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that he *might have mercy upon all.* O the *depth* of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How *unsearchable* are his judgments, and his ways *past finding out!*"* In these, and the parallel passages, which are numerous, the scheme of Divine mercy revealed in the Gospel is represented as involving considerations incomprehensible and inscrutable to human capacities—with which the minds of angels are engaged, and into which they "desire to look." And were there no other argument againt the Unitarian hypothesis, the consideration of its boasted simplicity—that it is such a scheme as man might have contrived, and as man can fathom; and that there is nothing pertaining to it to denominate it a great mystery; to demand the attention and scrutiny of angels; and to call forth those expressions of wonder and astonishment which often dropped from the lips of the admiring apostle—this single consideration, were there no other, so far from indicating its truth, might be sufficient to overthrow it.

The second argument in favor of theU nitarian creed is, "that it is constituted of articles, in which all believers of every name are *agreed;* it occupies the *common ground* of Christians."—If the consideration here suggested proves any thing to the purpose, it must be on the following assumed principle; that *whatever is undisputed in religion is true;* or that *doctrines are to be regarded as truth, so far only as they are matter of universal acquiescence.* And the standard of truth on this ground will be, not the Scriptures, but the *universal agreement of men.* But who does not see that this is a false standard; or rather that it is no standard at all? Mankind agree to-day, and disagree to-morrow. What one

* 1 Tim. iii. 16. 1 Pet. i. 12. Rom. xi. 33.

generation approves, another rejects. And if we have no standard of truth, but the universal agreement of men, clearly we have none at all. We do not admit indeed that the Unitarian creed "is constituted of articles, in which all believers of every name are agreed." With all its generality and ambiguity of expression, it contains several things, from which many, who claim to be regarded as Christians, would dissent. But suppose this were not the case—suppose it did "occupy the common ground of Christians;" this would be no evidence of its truth, unless it could be shown that the common ground of Christians in different ages, has been the same—that it is, *ipso facto*, the right ground—and that the agreement of men, rather than the word of God, is the ultimate standard in matters of faith.

It is urged, in the third place, in favor of the Unitarian creed, that this "is most agreeable to the *obvious meaning* and *general tenor* of the New Testament." As this proposition is supported by the mere assertion of the writer, it might be sufficient to reply to it by a contrary assertion. But we cannot, without doing violence to our own feelings, as well as injustice to the cause of truth, dismiss the subject with such a reply. It is our most sober conviction, that "the obvious meaning and general tenor of the New Testament," is decidedly *unfavorable* to the Unitarian system; and we hope to show, in few words, that this conviction is not entertained without sufficient reason. And if this is not the case—if the obvious meaning of the New Testament, as presented to the common reader, is not unfavorable to the Unitarian system; then why so much pains-taking among Unitarians to circulate what is falsely denominated an "Improved Version?" Why so much labor, by means of "various readings," and "conjectural emendations," to get rid of certain obnoxious portions and passages of the written word? And why such various and fruitless efforts to explain away a large class of passages, which can be disposed of by no other means?*—But what *is* the language of the New Testament on several of the points at issue between Unitarians and ourselves;—and, first, on the *Divinity* of the Saviour? "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and *the Word was God.*" "Christ, who is over all, *God blessed forever.*" "We are in him that is true, even in his Son, Jesus Christ; *this is the true God*, and eternal life." "Who thought it not robbery to be *equal with God.*" "Thy throne," saith the Father to the Son—"thy throne, O *God*, is forever and ever." "All men should *honor the Son*, even as they honor the Father." "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the *Almighty.*" "I am he who searcheth the reins and the heart." "Jesus Christ the

* Those who wish to see several noticeable exemplifications of the Unitarian mode of explaining away the Scriptures, may find them by recurring to articles headed "Biblical Criticism," in Nos. 30, 31, and 32 of the Christian Register for 1826. In the last of these articles, the writer, remarking upon the declaration of the apostle, (Col. i. 16, 17,) that by Christ "were all things *created*," &c. says, "No RESEMBLANCE OF WORDS *is alone adequate to support the opinion* that what is here said of *Christ*, is precisely that which is affirmed of *Jehovah*, in the Old Testament." But what is this but saying, "*Words cannot teach the doctrine*, that Christ is the creator of the world. *Language cannot express* the proper Divinity of the Saviour."—With writers such as this, to urge proof-texts surely must be of little consequence.

same, yesterday, to-day, and forever." "*All things were made by him*, and without him was not any thing made, that was made." "*By him were all things created*, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; *all things were created by him*, and *for him*; and he is *before all things*; and *by him all things consist.*" "At the name of Jesus, every knee shall bow, of things in heaven, and things on earth." "And when he had taken the book, the four beasts, and the four and twenty elders fell down before *the Lamb*, having every one of them harps, and golden vials full of odours, which are the *prayers of saints*. And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof; for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests, and we shall reign on the earth. And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne, and the beasts, and the elders; and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands; saying with a loud voice, *Worthy is the Lamb that was slain*, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing. And every creature which is in heaven, and on earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, *Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and to the* LAMB FOREVER AND EVER."*—Our readers have here a specimen of the plain language of the New Testament in regard to the *Divinity of the Saviour*. And without a single note or comment, we may safely leave it for them to decide, as to "the *obvious meaning*" of the inspired writers.

And when their decision on this point is formed, we will ask them to consider farther the language of the New Testament relative to the subject and object of the *Saviour's death*. "This is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many *for the remission of sins*." "Feed the church of God, which he hath *purchased with his own blood*." Believers are said to be "*justified by his blood*;" and to "have *redemption through his blood*, even the *forgiveness of sins*." "Whom God hath set forth, to be a PROPITIATION, *through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness, for the remission of sins that are past*; that *he might be just*, and the *justifier of him which believeth in Jesus*." Christ is said to have "given himself *for our sins*;" to have "suffered *for our sins*;" to be the "*propitiation* for our sins;" to have "*purged our sins*;" to have "*died for our sins*;" to have "put away sin by the *sacrifice of himself*;" and to have "*borne our sins in his own body on the tree*." His "*blood cleanseth us from all sin*." "Thou was slain, and hast *redeemed us to God by thy blood*." "Unto him that loved us, and *washed us from our sins in his own blood*, to him be glory and dominion, forever and ever. Amen."†—In these

* John i. 1. Rom. ix. 5. 1 John v. 20. Phil. ii. 6. Heb. i. 8. John v. 23. Rev. i. 8, and ii. 23. Heb. xiii. 8. John i. 3. Col. i. 16, 17. Phil. ii. 10. Rev. v. 8—13.

† Mat. xxvi. 28. Acts, xx. 28. Rom. v. 9. Eph. i. 7. Rom. iii. 25. Gal. i. 14. 1 Pet. iii. 18. 1 John ii. 2. Heb. i. 3. 1 Cor. xv. 3. Heb. ix. 26. 1 Pet. ii. 24. 1 John i. 7. Rev. v. 9, and i. 5.

passages, we see the manner, in which the writers of the New Testament every where speak of the blood—the death of Christ; and we may safely appeal to unprejudiced readers, as to the obvious import of their language. Did Christ die, as a mere *martyr*, in attestation of the truth of his doctrines? or did he suffer, as an *atoning sacrifice*, to make expiation for our sins? Did he shed his blood, for some unrevealed and indescribable purpose? or was it to show forth the righteousness of God; that so he might be just to himself, and yet the justifier of those who believe in Jesus?

Did our limits permit, we might proceed to give the language of the New Testament, on the subject of election—of human depravity—of regeneration by the special influence of the Holy Spirit—of justification by faith—of the perseverance of saints—and of future eternal punishment. We have no fear at all as to the result of an examination of this nature. We have read the New Testament for ourselves, and can judge for ourselves, at least of its more obvious meaning. Its divine authority is rejected by infidels, and philosophical critics, on the very ground that it contains the hated doctrines of the Orthodox faith; and we have no doubt that, were it confessedly a human production, it would be condemned and despised by Unitarians generally, as being of a high Orthodox character.

But we hasten to the *fourth* argument, in favor of the Unitarian creed, which is, that "the most important *corruptions* which have crept into the records of our faith, have been of a character to favor an *opposing system*; and that the more the Scriptures are restored to the precise words of their writers, the greater is the support which they give to the *rational system*."—On the "various readings" of the sacred Scriptures we shall say but very little; for, so far as respects the subject under consideration, we think them of very little consequence. One of the best judges now living* has remarked respecting them, that "out of some eight hundred thousand various readings, about seven hundred and ninety nine thousand are of just about as much importance, as the question in English orthography is, whether the word *honour* shall be spelled with the *u*, or without it. Of the remainder, some change the sense of particular passages or expressions, or omit particular words, or phrases, or insert them; but not one doctrine of religion is changed; not one precept is taken away; not one important fact is altered, by the whole of the various readings collectively taken."

And if it should appear from an examination of the text of Griesbach that some two or three passages read less favorably to the Orthodox system, than they do in the received text, this is no more than might reasonably be expected; as it was an acknowledged rule of Griesbach, in preparing his Testament, that "amongst various readings, that which, beyond the rest, manifestly *favors the Orthodox*, is *deservedly suspected*."† What could have led him to adopt such a rule, it is not our province to decide; but the influence of it, so far as it could apply at all, is very obvious; and renders every alteration, which it could have induced

* Professor Stuart.

† Vol. 1, page 13, Cambridge Edition.

him to make, of no possible authority.

The *fifth* argument for the Unitarian faith is derived from the *manner in which it has been opposed.* "The favorite and prevailing method" of opposition —so says the writer of the Tract —"has been to raise an outcry against it, and hinder men from fairly examining it."–The truth of this charge, as it is *here expressed*, we shall of course deny; and we challenge the author to support it by sufficient proof. The Orthodox have indeed represented Unitarianism as a false and delusive system of doctrine—as another Gospel—and as eminently calculated to blind and destroy the souls of its votaries. They have made such representations, because they most sincerely believe them to be true. And with this view, they have endeavored, in some instances, to keep their children and dependants—those under their care and influence, from being infected and ruined by it. They have felt that, with no appearance of consistency or propriety, they could do otherwise. But does all this prove Unitarianism true? Is every thing true, which the Orthodox regard as false? Or is every thing fair, and lovely, and of good report, which they think is directly the opposite? Is their intellectual and moral vision so notoriously perverted, that it is a sound argument, in face of the world, in favor of any religious system, that they regard it as unscriptural and dangerous? The Orthodox reject and condemn Deism, and Mahometanism, and Judaism, and all the forms of Pagan idolatry. But does this fact go to establish the truth of these various and diverse schemes of pretended religion? Or is the dissent of the Orthodox from the religious opinions of Unitarians, and their regarding these opinions as dangerous and ruinous, to be urged as an argument in favor of their truth?

The *sixth* argument in favor of the Unitarian faith is "found in the fact, that this is the system adopted by a great portion of those who are educated in *another* faith, and who have always had *another system* preached to them." They are, it seems, though they know it not, *Unitarians;* and "have no idea of any different religious principles, from those which" Unitarians inculcate.—This argument—if it be not an abuse of words to call it argument—it will be seen, at once, is sheer assertion; and an assertion too that will disgust and astonish all those of whom it is made. It is an assertion, we are sure, which they will not be very ready to admit, as it is made without any attempt at proof, and as it contradicts the most sober convictions of their own minds. We were at a loss, at first, to account for it, that such an assertion should ever have been hazarded; and we can now account for it, only on the ground of the misconceptions and misrepresentations of Unitarians, in regard to the real system of the Orthodox. They never represent our sentiments fairly, and seem unable, or unwilling, to conceive of them as they are. In the Tract before us, every representation attempted to be made of Orthodox principles is no better than a caricature. Expressions are used, or a coloring is given, to which no man, in his senses, would be willing to subscribe. Doubtless, when Unitarians inquire of one, who has been educated in the Orthodox

faith, whether he receives that faith in the manner in which it is represented by them; he will answer, no. He has no idea of such a system. He "counts it a slander to attribute to him such a faith, and holds it unfair and ungenerous to charge him with maintaining such dogmas." But what does this confession prove? Not that Orthodox principles, as received and inculcated by their abettors, are untrue; but merely that these principles are misrepresented and slandered, in the lips of their enemies.

The *seventh* argument in favor of Unitarian sentiments is, that "these are the views of Christian truth, into which men have been prone to *settle down*, wherever inquiry has been left perfectly free, and no persecution or loss could attend their profession. So it was at *Geneva;* and so it has been "in *Boston* and *its vicinity.*"—We are a little surprised that the Unitarians of Geneva should be referred to in this connexion. Do the Unitarians of "Boston and its vicinity" intend, indeed, to claim affinity with their brethren of the Swiss Cantons? Do they know the extent with which these boasted brethren are now chargeable with the odious and horrible crime of persecution? that, in the nineteenth century, and to the disgrace of Protestantism throughout the world, they are deposing and banishing able and faithful ministers of Christ, for no crime, than that of disagreeing with them in their religious views? What if the Orthodox churches of Scotland, England, or the United States, were chargeable with a similar outrage upon the rights of Unitarians? Would the world be able to contain the story of their wrongs? And yet the Unitarians of Geneva are here referred to, without a note of censure, as brethren in good fellowship with those of our own country.* But to return to the argument;—we have no doubt, that, in seasons of worldly rest and prosperity, there has been a tendency in some churches towards the Unitarian faith; just as there was a tendency, uniformly, among the ancient Israelites, in seasons of outward rest and peace, to forget and forsake the Lord; and just as there was a tendency, in the primitive Christian churches, when rescued from the fires of Pagan persecution, and established in quiet, upon the throne of the Cæsars, to adopt a pompous and worldly religion. But what does this tendency of things prove? That Unitarianism is the true religion; or that it is false? that it is adapted to sustain the sinking soul, in times of worldly calamity and trial; or that it is adapted to gratify a careless and worldly spirit?

The *eighth* argument in favor of Unitarianism is derived from "the *moral* and *practical character* of the system." It is thought to be eminently moral and practical, because it insists upon the *preceptive* parts of the Bible, to the neglect of its *doctrines.* "It is satisfied to know what God requirs of us, without making it essential that we should understand all the designs of the divine adminstration." But are Unitarians yet ignorant, that the *doctrines* of revealed religion lie at the foundation of its *duties?* that they set forth the *reason* of them, and the *motives* by which they are enforced? How can the

* An attempt has been made in the Christian Examiner for Jan. and Feb. 1827, to *palliate,* if not *justify,* the late persecutions at Geneva.

duty of *repentance* be strongly enforced, without inculcating the doctrine of *depravity?* or the duty of *loving* and *confiding in the Saviour*, without setting forth his *Divinity*, and his *atoning blood?* or the duty of *obeying the divine law* generally, without insisting upon the fearful *penalty* of disobedience? The very reason here urged, to show that Unitarianism must be an eminently practical system, is sufficient to show that it cannot be such a system. And the invariable result of it, wherever it has been generally adopted, goes to confirm us in this conclusion. We know, indeed, that there are many moral and amiable men among Unitarians; but Dr. Priestley admitted, in respect to the mass of them, that "their moral conduct, though decent, is *not what is deemed strict and exemplary;*" and that those who hold evangelical principles, "have less apparent conformity to the world, and seem to have more of a real principle of religion."*

The *ninth* and last argument in favor of Unitarianism is, that "*unbelievers* and *men of the world* are compelled to look upon it with *approbation and respect.*"—We are truly astonished, that an argument such as this should be urged in support of any religious system. Do the scriptures represent that "unbelievers, and men of the world," are accustomed to look upon the *true* religion, "with approbation and respect?" Or do they everywhere represent the contrary? "We preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews, a *stumbling block;* and unto the Greeks, *foolishness.*" "Every one that doeth evil *hateth the light.*" "*Ye seek to kill me,* a man that hath told you *the truth*, which I have heard of God: This did not Abraham."—The fact alleged in the argument under consideration, we freely admit. We believe and *know* it to be true. And this is one among the many marks, that Unitarianism is *not* "the faith once delivered to the saints"—is *not* the religion of the Gospel. It is a system suited to the tastes and dispositions of the irreligious and worldly. It proves itself suited, not to humble such characters in the dust, and lead them to beg for delivering mercy; but, on the contrary, to nurture their pride, quiet their consciences, and render them easy and happy in their sins. But such was not a trait of that holy religion, which Christ came to reveal, and which his apostles labored to establish.

We have now gone through with the nine "strong reasons" of the writer of this Tract, for supposing that Unitarianism is "the faith once delivered to the saints." What weight will be attached to them, or to our remarks respecting them, in the minds of our readers, we will not venture to predict. They have received as much attention, perhaps, as they deserve—certainly as much as our limits will allow us to bestow.

Before dismissing this tract, we will subjoin a few words relative to a passage in it, on the death of Christ. "We *admit*," says the writer, "because it is revealed, the connexion of the Saviour's sufferings and death, with the extension of pardon and salvation to unworthy man; but we do not pretend to explain, or to *understand* fully, that connexion. We think it enough to rejoice in the *fact*, that the divine mercy is thus exercised, without explaining the

* Discourses on Various Subjects, pp. 95, 96.

secrets of the divine administration, or presuming to say that God cannot, or can, pardon, in this or that way." (p. 11.) We here see, that Unitarians, as well as others, can *believe*, what they "do not pretend to explain, or to *understand*." They can rejoice in a revealed *fact*, without pretending to comprehend the *manner*, in which such fact exists. But if they can do this in respect to *one* thing, why not *another?* And if *they* can do it, why may not *others* do the same? Why may not Trinitarians believe the *fact*, because they think it revealed, that in the *one* eternal Jehovah, there are *three distinctions*, commonly called persons; although they "do not pretend to explain, or to understand," the *manner*, in which that fact exists?

The remaining Tracts, in the series, will be examined in our future numbers, as opportunity presents.

Missionary Intelligence.

From the Missionary Herald.

GREAT MEETING OF ARMENIANS AT CONSTANTINOPLE.

THE following letter from Mr. Goodell, dated Beyroot, Sept. 29, 1826, and addressed to the Corresponding Secretary of the Board, describes one of the most remarkable events of this eventful age. The occurrences reported are, indeed, so wonderful, so beyond what even the friends and supporters of missions had dared to expect, that at first they seem almost incredible. The reader should observe, however, that the letter was written on the 29th of September, that the substance of it was confirmed on the 5th of the following month, and not doubted by the missionaries, on the 18th:—at which time, Mr. Goodell wrote to the Corresponding Secretary in the manner following:

I wrote you on the 15th, and again on the 29th ult. Should you receive this first, you will do well, perhaps, to make no public use of it, till those previous communications shall have come to hand. Some of the accounts may seem to you strange and contradictory, and indeed they seem so to us. There is a movement upon the minds of many, a "sound in the tops of the mulberry trees," but what the result will be, what turn the affairs will finally take, will be developed hereafter.—But in the midst of religious inquiry and discussion, and of singular public acts abroad, it demands our gratitude, that there continues around us, in the immediate sphere of our own labors, a "spirit of grace," abasing the lofty, subduing the rebellious, and making solemn the thoughtless and gay.

Excitement produced at Constantinople, by Mr. King's Farewell Letter to the People of Syria; with the consequent proceedings.

My Dear Sir,—Though it was only yesterday, that I sealed and forwarded a long communication for you, yet I cannot refrain from giving you additional information, which has just come to hand from Constantinople.

It seems, that Mr. King's Farewell Letter, which, (with considerable additions by myself, having special reference to the Armenians,) we had translated into Turkish, found its way to Constantinople in Signor Wortabet's hand-writing, and produced an amazing excitement among the one hundred thousand Armenians of that capital. A council was immediately held, consisting of all the Armenian monks, and priests, and bishops, and patriarchs, of whom several happened at that time to be at Constantinople; also of all the principal Armenians of the laity; together with two of the Greek patriarchs, viz. the Greek patriarch of Constantinople, and the patriarch of Jerusalem.

Mr. King's letter, with the Scripture proofs, which I had furnished abundantly in the margin, was then read, with a suitable pause after each section; and the question was solemnly asked, "Are these things so? Are the facts, stated in this letter, true? And is the letter itself agreeable to the word of God?"

The Bible, yes, the holy, blessed, long neglected Bible, was produced, and examined; and when they could not make it speak a different language from the letter, they called for the original Greek, in order to be sure that their translation was a faithful one. In the end, they were forced to acknowledge, that the letter was agreeable to the holy Scriptures.

The monks and priests and bishops, then said to the patriarchs:—"Three of your principal men have, agreeably to this letter, and to the Bible, married wives; and are now overturning the whole system of our church. If they are doing right, we will all go and do likewise; but, if they are not doing right, we insist upon your putting an immediate

stop to their proceedings, and bringing them to justice."

Here they were all in a perfect dilemma, and the council was divided. At last, the principal Armenians said to their ecclesiastics:—"This business does not belong to us; it belongs to you. We know very well that you are all bad men; that, with all your professions of purity, you are the most impure among the defiled; that you have in your cloisters both women and children; and that you annually pay much money, which all comes from our pockets, for this abominable purpose. But this is not *our* business, it is *yours;* and we leave it with you to act as you please."

After much disputation and recrimination, the following resolutions were finally agreed upon.

1. That all the former deacons, and priests and bishops, in the convent at Jerusalem, be required to leave the convent immediately, and that the patriarch put in their place a few persons, whom he may choose; provided they be persons once married, but now widowers.

2. That, from this day, until *twenty five years* have expired, no individual be allowed to become a monk, or to be ordained a priest.

3. That boys and women be not permitted to go hereafter on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem; and that if men go, they be not allowed to remain more than four days in Jerusalem, and *that they never be again permitted to witness the pretended miracle of the holy fire.*

To this last resolution, the Greek patriarchs made many objections, and earnestly besought that it might not pass;—"For," said they, "if we now let it be known, that the miracle of the holy fire was all an imposition, we shall be ridiculed by our enemies, and shall lose all credit with our own people, many of whom will become Turks."

But all the resolutions passed, and the patriarch of Constantinople sent letters, officially, through all his patriarchate, to put them in execution.

The first resolution was passed in consequence of the low state of the convent, the decline of which is attributed, in a great measure, to the influence of the Armenians, who are with me.

The second resolution was in consequence of the universal complaint of the ignorance, profligacy, and numbers of the clergy. The high probability at present is, that not another Armenian will ever take the *monastic vow.*

To this plain statement, which was made to me yesterday by an Armenian, who was present at the council, and saw and heard all that passed, I need add no comments. You yourself will perceive, that the Armenians are evidently ripe for a moral revolution.

Importance of an Armenian Press.

Now for an Armenian press. I most ardently wish to pour fifty thousand Tracts upon Armenia next year, and to bring all her numerous, enterprising, interesting population under the influence of heavenly truth. Is it too much to hope, that, before the expiration of the *twenty five years,* we shall be instrumental in raising up for her a holy priesthood, and of making, even her, a *peculiar people, zealous of good works.*

In the present unsettled state of the country, perhaps it would be imprudent to set up the press at Beyroot, and perhaps Smyrna and Constantinople would be no better. But it can go into immediaate operation at Malta, and I can send either my archbishop, or my priest, (both of whom, I hope, have become truly regenerated, though the change is more marked in the latter,) to correct the proof sheets under the general direction of Mr. Temple, or Mr. Smith.

Confirmation of the foregoing Intelligence.

Oct. 5.—Most of the above information respecting the Armenians, has been since confirmed.

In the midst of fears and hopes, of lowering and brightening prospects, I close this communication, and recommend this mission to your special prayers.

Wm. Goodell.

Ordinations and Installations.

At Washington City, Mr. Rollin H. Neal, as Pastor of the Second Baptist Chh. in that City. Sermon by Rev. Samuel Cornelius, of Alexandria.

March 2,—Rev. James Alexander was ordained by the Hanover Presbytery, and installed as Pastor of the Church at Charlotte Court House, Va. Sermon by Rev. B. H. Rice.

March 14,—Rev. I. P. Labagh was ordained at Waterford, N. Y. by the classis of Washington. Sermon by the Rev. Mr. Duryee.

March 15,—Rev. Isaac Cummings was ordained as Pastor of the Congregational Church in Dover, Vt. Sermon by Rev. C. Bates, of Newfane.

March 28,—Mr. Alonzo Hill was ordained as Colleague Pastor with Rev. Dr. Bancroft, of the Second Congregational Society in Worcester. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Brazer.

THE

CHRISTIAN MAGAZINE.

VOL. IV. JUNE, 1827. No. 6.

For the Christian Magazine.

EXPOSITION OF 2 PETER, III. 14—16.

"*Wherefore, beloved, seeing that ye look for such things, be diligent that ye may be found of him in peace, without spot, and blameless. And account that the long-suffering of our Lord is salvation; even as our beloved brother Paul also, according to the wisdom given unto him, hath written unto you; As also in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things; in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction.*"

THE persons here addressed are, undoubtedly, strangers, scattered throughout several provinces, "Elect, according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience, and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." The things, for which they are represented as looking, are evidently the glorious things, which God has promised those who love him; that incorruptible and undefiled inheritance, reserved for them in heaven.

Their election unto holiness, and the promises of God predicated thereon, are here urged as the foundation of an argument, not, that they should continue in sin, but, that they should be actively holy: "*Wherefore*—be diligent, that ye may be found of him in peace, without spot and blameless: and account that the long-suffering of our Lord is salvation." Ransomed rebels, elected unto holiness and salvation, by the sovereign grace of God, are under the greatest obligations to live devoted to his service. Without active holiness, even they cannot be admitted to heaven; for it is only through faith and patience, that they will inherit the promises. Surely, therefore, the long-suffering of God is their salvation. It bore with them, in all their sins, until they were led to true repentance, pardoned through the blood of the Son, sanctified by the Holy Spirit, and, in the plenitude of mercy and goodness, admitted to the joys of the blessed.

The apostle Paul, as the passage asserts, taught the same things. The doctrine of election unto holiness and the consequent duty of the elect to be holy, forms a prominent part of all his writings. He addressed an epistle to the churches of, at least, one of these provinces, in which the doctrine of justification by faith, a doctrine closely linked with that of election unto holiness, seems to be the grand point of discussion. Yet, having just enunciated his chief proposition, he adds, Gal. ii. 17, 18, "But if, while we seek to be justified by Christ, we ourselves also are found sinners, is therefore Christ

the minister of sin? God forbid. For if I build again the things which I destroyed, I make myself a transgressor." This is as much as to say, 'should I continue to sin, through presumption that I am justified by Christ, and elected unto holiness, I should thereby prove that I am not justified, and destroy all evidence that I am of the number of the elect; for Christ is not the minister of sin.'

But in what sense are some things in these epistles so hard to be understood, that the unlearned and unstable wrest them as they do also the other scriptures, to their own destruction? Some have supposed, that they contain things too abstruse for common understandings; and mysteries, which belong only to God. But they make a part of the things which are revealed, and therefore God says, that they belong unto us and unto our children. They are therefore a plain rule of duty, and apparently no part of them could be more plain, than those parts of the epistles of Paul, in which he speaks of these things. His arguments are always clear, and conclusive; and it seems as if one must be at some pains to misunderstand them. What then is the meaning of the phrase under consideration? The word here rendered, "hard to be understood," does not, in the Greek language, signify difficult to be perceived, but hard to be received by the heart: and the word rendered unlearned, undeniably means *undisciplied*, as an entirely different word is, I believe invariably, used, where it refers to human education. In this view the passage is perfectly clear. There are many things, in the epistles of Paul and Peter, and in the other scriptures, which are very unpleasant to the minds of the *undisciplied*. But among them all, there is not one more so, than that of election unto holiness, together with the consequent duty of perfect devotedness to God, and the unavoidable inference, that "without holiness, no man shall see the Lord." Unholy men therefore say now, as did others formerly, on another occasion, "This is a hard saying, who can hear it." They are hard to them in the same sense; that is, not because they lack faculties to perceive their meaning, but, because they are unpleasant to their unholy hearts.

Hence the unstable, among them, wrest the scriptures, and these things in particular. The stable, among even the undisciplied, will not wrest them; for they know that the word and purposes of God will stand, and, that wresting this word could be of no avail. But the unstable often wrest the inspired writings in various ways.

They often endeavour to make them advance things, which they do not really contain. They prejudge, concerning what the bible ought to say, and then wrest passages from their proper meaning, that they may appear to inculcate it. Instead of forming a system from the bible, they endeavour to conform the bible to their system. Instead of using their reasoning faculties, in discovering the evidences, that the bible is the word of God, and in ascertaining what doctrines it contains, they give the name of reason to the suggestions of their carnal minds, prompting them to wrest these scriptures, so as to make them conform to their systems, and, thereby, become agreeable to their hearts.

They also often wrest them, by endeavouring to explain away

their meaning. As the bible, especially the epistles of Paul, contain many things very unpleasant to their minds, they therefore vainly attempt to explain them away. Arminians have endeavoured to explain away the doctrine of election, by what the scriptures say of the necessity of good works; Antinomians, the necessity of holiness, by what they say of God's absolute decree of election; and Universalists, the vindictive justice of the Lord, by what they say of his boundless mercy and goodness. Thus have various sects explained away every doctrine of the word of God.

Many also wrest the scriptures by representing, that they contain contradictions. They often try to confute doctrines and absolve themselves from duties, inculcated in one part of God's word, by quoting others which they say contradict them. This is wresting God's word, and impeaching his veracity. It says that he contradicts himself. "He that reproveth God let him answer it."

They also wrest them, when they use them for mere argument. They were given us, for our directory. They contain eternal truths, truths by which we ought to live, by which we shall be judged, and the effects of which we must experience forever. To use these scriptures for mere unhallowed speculation, is, therefore, wresting them from their proper use, and must be productive of awful consequences. Hence,

They also wrest them, when they quote them irreverently. They are God's message. They are full of moment. They denounce eternal death on the sinner, offer free grace and pardon to the penitent, and unfold judgment and eternity to view. To make these words of the eternal Jehovah, a theme upon which to display wit, or vent ridicule, or make vain and indecent allusions, is wresting and profaning the most hallowed oracles of God. It is most daring and impious mockery against Jehovah himself.

We may therefore see how wresting these things proves the destruction of those who are engaged in the practice. They thereby commit an awful sin, and desire to embrace fatal errors. When they have thus wearied out the patience of God, he sends them strong delusions, that they may believe a lie, and often gives them over to their own hearts lusts. They then cast off all regard for the bible and its institutions, or else settle down on false and delusive hopes of heaven. Thus they become ripe for awful, aggravated, and sudden destruction. C.

From the Utica Christian Repository.

THE PILGRIM'S PROGRESS IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.—BY BUNYANUS.

CHAPTER XVII.

In this manner the pilgrims went on, till they had got out of the Valley of the Shadow of Death, and came to that part of the road where Christian had seen the blood and bones of pilgrims, who were formerly slain by the giants Pope and Pagan, who dwelt in a cave hard by. And as they approached the mouth of the cave, a genteel looking man came out to meet them, whose name was *Free-thinking;* and bowing to them, accosted them as follows:

Fr.-th. Your servant, gentlemen. I perceive by your habit,

that you are pilgrims. I am a friend to you, being equally a friend to all men. This cave was formerly occupied by the common enemies of the human race, by whom many were put to death, and many more held in the cruel bondage of tyranny and superstition. I have prevailed against these enemies of mankind, and have put an end to their cruelties. Pope is not, indeed, entirely dead; but I have bound him in chains, and keep him close prisoner in his own cave. Please to walk in, and gratify your eyes with the sight of your old enemy, and learn how much you are indebted to me for delivering you from his power.

Thoughtful. We acknowledge ourselves greatly indebted to the good providence of our Lord and King, for delivering us from the fear of persecution unto death, for walking in his ways. Whatever instruments he has been pleased to make use of, to accomplish that object, our obligations to him are the same. And whenever he disposes any of our fellow creatures to show kindness to us, we are willing to acknowledge our obligations to them also. Will you please to tell us your name, that we may know who it is that claims our gratitude at this time?

Fr.-th. My name is Freethinking. I have long been engaged in endeavoring to deliver mankind from the bondage of superstition, in all its forms. I have completely overcome this old enemy of religious freedom, and would gladly do you a further kindness; for I perceive you have still some superstitious notions. But, come in with me to my residence, that I may show you what I have done, and am still doing for the benefit of mankind; and may introduce you to some of my chosen friends. I have a goodly company of them now with me, who are all equally desirous with myself, of promoting religious freedom. Here is Voltaire, and Volney, and Hume, and Gibbon, and Paine, and Godwin, all champions in the cause; with many others, who have distinguished themselves by their endeavors to deliver men from the tyranny of priestcraft and superstition, and secure to them the right of private judgment in matters of religion. We have strong claims upon the gratitude of mankind; and we expect our claims to be acknowledged.

Th. I have heard of you and your friends, and am not disposed to admit your high claims upon the gratitude of mankind. You have not only endeavored to destroy the tyranny of priestcraft and superstition; but, under that pretence, you have endeavored to destroy all religion, and rob mankind of their best support in adversity, and their only hope in death. You are as really enemies to the prince Immanuel, and his kingdom, as to the giant Pope, and his authority; and would destroy both together, if you could. And as to your boasted achievements in destroying the power of the latter, and binding him in chains, for which you claim our acknowledgments, they do not amount to much. Wickliffe, and Luther, and Calvin, and Knox, and their associates, had already done much more towards it, before you began your efforts, than you have done since. When the pilgrim Christian passed this way, the giant Pope was so infirm, as to be unable to do him any injury. And your only merit is that of seizing upon a poor, decrepit

old man, and loading him with chains, when he had already lost his power of resistance. If divine providence has made any use of you and your friends, to promote the cause of genuine religious liberty, you have not meant so, neither have your hearts thought so. So that, if our Lord and King deserves our praise for his good design in this, you and your associates deserve the abhorrence of mankind, for your bad designs in it.

Fr.-th. You talk like one under the influence of fanaticism. Do you really suppose there is any divine providence, which regulates human affairs?

Th. I do most firmly believe in a universal and particular providence, which directs all events in the wisest and best possible manner. I believe that our Lord and King "worketh all things after the counsel of his own will," so that "not a sparrow falleth to the ground without him," nor even a hair of our heads.

Fr.-th. Why should that great Being, who made the world, (if there is any such,) concern himself with the little, petty affairs of men, who, in comparison with him, are as nothing, and less than nothing, and vanity?

Th. Because he "hath made all things for himself;" and must have done it with some design: for no intelligent being acts without design. And that design he will undoubtedly accomplish.

Fr.-th. What possible design could he have in making this grain of sand, or what possible purpose can ever be answered by it?

Th. I know not what particular purpose he intended to answer by this grain of sand; but the creation of this small thing required an exertion of almighty power, as really as the creation of the world. And it would be absurd to suppose almighty power was exerted, by a Being of infinite wisdom, without any design. And it would be an impeachment of his wisdom to suppose that design was not a good design, and worthy the exertion of almighty power to accomplish. I conclude, then, that when the Creator made that grain of sand, he intended to dispose of it in some way for his own glory. And that wise intention will be accomplished, or it will fail. Do you say it will fail? If it should fail, it must be because the Creator forgets it, or alters his mind, or has not power sufficient to accomplish it. But he will never forget any of his infinitely wise and benevolent purposes: he is not a being that forgets. Do you say he will alter his mind? If he should alter his mind, he must do it for some reason, or for no reason. He will not do it without any reason; for he is not capricious. What reason can he have? Not any new information which he had not when he formed the purpose; for he has always been infinite in knowledge: he never acquirs any new information. It is certain, therefore, that he will never alter his mind. Does he want the power of accomplishing any of his infinitely wise purposes? No; he is infinite in power. He will, therefore, certainly accomplish the design he had in making that grain of sand. And he will keep his eye upon it, and cause it to be, in every instant of time, just where he always intended it should be; and he will do all that with it which he always intended to do. And so, of every thing he has created, whether great or small.

Fr.-th. May not all things take place according to the original design of the Creator, by the mere force of the laws of nature, without any particular providence? You know a clock will go, after it passes out of the hands of its maker, and even after its maker is dead. Why not so with this world?

Th. That is, why may not the Creator of this world be dead, and yet all things go on according to his original intention, by the mere force of the laws of nature? I might think so, indeed, if I thought the laws of nature could be any thing beside the established mode of the divine operation. To suppose they are any thing else, would be, indeed, to give up the doctrine of providence, and with it, a good part of the evidence that the Creator is now in existence; which I am not inclined to do.

Fr.-th. Why not give it up, then, if you have no proof of its existence?

Th. I have proof, which satisfies my mind, both of the present existence of the Creator, and of his universal and particular providence. Every event I see take place, is evidence to me of both.

Fr.-th. What evidence does it furnish? I see none. I refer every thing to Nature.

Th. Then you ascribe to Nature, the attributes and works of God. But Nature is not the name of any being; much less, of that great, and wise, and powerful, and good Being, who is the Creator, and Preserver, and Governor of the universe. His name is God. But I will answer your question. Nothing begins to exist without a cause, which produces it. Suppose a particular act of choice of any creature. It begins to exist, and must be produced by some cause. What is the cause? Does the creature cause his own act of choice? How does he cause it? If he causes it, he causes it voluntarily or involuntarily. Does he cause it involuntarily? No: intelligent creatures never cause any thing involuntarily. Involuntary motions are not properly their *acts.* If that creature causes his own act of choice, he causes it voluntarily; that is, by choosing its existence. But if he causes it by choosing its existence, that makes two acts of choice, by one of which he causes the other. What, then, caused the first? Did he cause that, by another before the first? To suppose that a creature causes his own acts of choice, drives us into the absurdity of supposing him to perform one act before his first act. And if we suppose any other creature to cause them, we shall be driven into the same absurdity. But they are caused by some being; and there are no beings but creatures and their Creator. It is the Creator, then, who causes all the actions of all intelligent creatures. And in the same manner it may be proved that he causes all events in the natural world; which proves his universal providence; and, of course, his present existence also.

Fr.-th. Why may we not say, a man causes his own act of choice, without supposing him to *do* any thing to cause it?

Th. That which *does* nothing to produce an effect, does not produce that effect. It would be a perversion of language, to call that a *cause* of an effect, which does nothing to produce it. But, come, brother, we are losing time to talk with this man. He is an enemy to our Lord, and

would beguile us of all that consolation which we derive from the consideration of living under his infinitely wise government. Let us be going.

So they left the man, and went on their way, conversing together as follows:

Ardent. Why did you not prove the doctrine of providence to this man, by citing passages from the King's book? That kind of proof would be more satisfactory to me. I do not so well understand metaphysics; and you know there is a great prejudice against all metaphysical reasoning in matters of religion.

Th. This man would only make a mock of proof from the King's book; for he denies the authority of that book, and seems even to question the existence of the King himself. He professes to follow reason; and, therefore, the best way to silence him, is to show that reason is as much against him as the King's book itself. When men bring metaphysical objections against the truths contained in that book, and do not feel the force of those proofs which that book furnishes, it becomes necessary to abandon the contest, and suffer them to triumph; or else, to meet them on their own ground, and vanquish them with their own weapons. The most plausible objections which the enemies of truth bring forward against the doctrines contained in the King's book, are of a metaphysical nature; and if we decline meeting these objections with a metaphysical answer, they will be likely to think them unanswerable. But when we show them that their objections can be answered in their own way, as well as by the King's book, and that those truths can be demonstrated by reason, as well as supported by divine authority; they have usually no resort left, but to turn about, and raise an outcry against metaphysics. It was the remark of one who understood something of human nature, that "no man is greatly against metaphysics, till he finds that metaphysics are against him." And, indeed, what are we made rational creatures for, if we are never to use our reason? The great error respecting the use of reason, consists in setting up the authority of reason above that of the King's book, and making our metaphysics give laws to revelation; as all those do, who reject the plain, obvious dictates of the King's book, because they cannot reconcile them to their own views of what is proper. We are to use our reason in ascertaining what is the plain, obvious import of the language contained in that book, and in discovering how that is confirmed by the essential perfections of the Creator, as discovered by his works; and not in attempting to dictate what that book ought, and what it ought not to teach, as many do. And having ascertained what it does teach, we are to submit implicitly to its authority, whether we can remove all difficulties by our reason or not.

By this time they had arrived at the ascent cast up in the way, where Christian saw Faithful before him; and from this they discovered their old fellow travellers, Feel-well, Love-self, and No-law, but a little before them, with whom they soon came up. And having inquired after each other's welfare, they asked also how each party had got along through the Valley of the Shadow of Death; and when Thoughtful and Ardent had told how they

had fared, the others replied as follows:

Feel-well. We got through the valley without any trouble at all. And I cannot but wonder that others should think it such a frightful place.

Love-self. I was all the way looking out for the terrible things which others have described; but this was all the trouble I had, for I saw none of them.

No-law. I had no such trouble; for my faith never fails me in any circumstances.

Feel-well. Aye; there is nothing like strong faith to overcome every impediment.

Th. But it appears that you had none to overcome; and so had no opportunity to try your faith.

Ard. Our Lord and King sometimes restrains the fiends of the pit, and sometimes lets them loose, as he sees best: so that the passage through this valley is very different to different persons.

Love-self. Yes; and I take it to be an indication of his peculiar affection for us, that he restrained them while we were passing through.

Feel-well. I take it as an evidence that we have more religion than others. The fiends of the pit knew they could make no impression upon us, and so kept their distance.

Th. I should think it unsafe to draw any such conclusion. For if the fiends of the pit knew any to be self deceived, they would like to help keep up the deception; and so, would give them no trouble.

Ard. Where did you lodge last night?

Feel-well. At the house of Mr. *Anything.* He is a very agreeable man, and a great lover of pilgrims. His conversation was very edifying to me, and all his words went to my heart.

Love-self. It was very edifying to me too. He agreed with me in every thing.

No-law. He agreed with me too, when I talked with him alone.

Ard. We saw him a few minutes this morning; and he professed to agree with us. I conclude that is his practice. He tries to please all, by appearing to fall in with their opinions.

Th. Yes; he agreed with each of you, separately, and talked in favor of the opinions of him he was talking with. And so he always does. He is constant in nothing but in his supreme attachment to himself.

Feel-well. You are too uncharitable, brother. I have seen it in you, every time we have met. You seem to think every body is wrong, but such as agree with you in every thing. You condemn selfishness in others; but what can be more selfish, than to wish to bring every one to *your* standard?

Th. If my attachment to my principles is merely because they are *mine*, I confess it is selfish and wrong. And if my wish to have others think as I do, is merely to strengthen my party, it ought to be condemned and abhored. But, is it not possible that real *charity* for others may make me wish them to embrace my principles?

Feel-well. I am willing to think charitably of you; and so I am willing to admit that your motives may be good. But really, it does not appear much like charity, to be so forward to condemn others.

Th. Charity is good will. If I wish well to another, and see him in a mistake about himself, of great importance, and one that endangers his soul, I shall wish

to have him undeceived, and set right. I do believe that all selfish religion is false religion; and if a man trusts in it, and has no better, I believe he is in a fundamental and fatal error. Now, if I see one trusting in such an error, and venturing his soul upon it, as I fear many do, I think *charity*, that is, good will, would require me to try to undeceive him, and bring him to renounce his error and embrace the truth, that he may be saved. On the contrary, it would show a want of charity in me towards my neighbour, if I should let him go on in a fatal error; and, instead of trying to undeceive him, should encourage him in it, by treating him as if I supposed he was safe enough already.

Feel-well. You have a strange notion of charity. I always thought it to be a good opinion of others; or a disposition to think well of them, and to treat them as Christians, if they professed to be so. Where did you get your strange notion of it?

Th. From the King's book. The word which is translated *charity*, is the same that is translated *love;* and that makes me think they are both one.

Feel-well. Oh yes; they are both one. Love is the substance of all religion. And it is my love to my neighbour that prompts me to think well of him, and to be willing he should have his own way in religious matters, as well as I mine.

Th. Indeed! Do you think, then, that all religions are equally right, and equally safe?

Feel-well. No; I think my own is the best and safest.

Th. Then you are inconsistent with yourself. If you love your neighbour, you must wish to see him taking the best way to secure his eternal interests. And just as much as you think one way is safer than another, and really wish him well, you must wish to see him taking that way. And if you think your way is the best and safest, and wish your neighbour well, you must wish him to take your way. I think disinterested religion is the only religion that will bear the trial of the great day; and therefore, *charity*, or love to my neighbour, makes me wish him to renounce every other and embrace that.

Feel-well. I have none of that disinterested religion, and I wish for none of it. My religion makes me happy; and by that I know it is right.

Th. How do you know your religion is right, from its making you happy?

Feel-well. The Black Tyrant cannot give me any happiness, for he has none himself. Men cannot give me any, for they have none to spare. The Celestial King only can give it to me; and he has done it; and I know I am right, because I feel happy. Glory to the King!

Th. If your own safety is your great object, and your happiness all arises from a belief that you are safe, I see not why the great deceiver or his earthly children could not make you happy, by telling you that you are safe, provided you believe them, even though it should be a lie that you believe; as I fear it is.

Feel-well. How is it, that I can think favorably of you, and embrace you as a brother pilgrim, while you cannot think so favorably of me?

Th. If you are right, I am safe; because I have some of your kind of religion as well as you. I have some selfish affections on religious subjects, and

some animal feelings, as well as you; and I have some happy feelings too. But if my principles are right, you are not safe. For if disinterested religion is necessary, and you have none of it, you are lost. It is consistent, therefore, for you to think favorably of me; while it is not consistent for me to think favorably of you, if your religion is what you say it is. You approve of that in me, which I condemn, both in myself and you. And that which I approve, and which I believe will alone stand the test of the great day, you entirely disavow and condemn. Your selfishness leads you to have some fellowship for me, but charity itself forbids that I should have any fellowship for you, or for any kind of selfish religion wherever it may be found.

For the Christian Magazine.

HOW OUGHT GOD TO BE WORSHIPPED?

THOUGH the answer to this question is perfectly obvious and easy to some, yet, in the view of others, it is attended with difficulties. I shall attempt, in this paper, to establish the following positions. 1. That God should be worshipped *only* as existing in three Persons. 2. That the worship so rendered is not *in any degree subordinate* to either, but *equal to each.* 3. That we may address either Person in our prayers, separately, or bringing only one into view, for *any* favors we need. 4. That this is consistent with God's being worshipped only as existing in three Persons.

1. God should be worshipped *only* as existing in three Persons; the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. This appears *first*, from the fact that this is the only mode in which he has informed us that he exists. He has, indeed, declared that he is but one God; yet he has also and at the same time, revealed himself as existing in three Persons. Those, therefore, who would worship him, must worship him as thus existing, or they cannot worship *God.* For if these Persons are inseparably connected in a mysterious union, they are essential to the existence of God, and it would hence be impossible to worship him truly as existing in any other way.

But *secondly*, the same truth is confirmed by several passages of Scripture. Eph. 2: 18, "For through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father." Here the Apostle seems to speak of this as *the* way and only way that we are to approach God. A similar sentiment is expressed in John 14: 6, "No man cometh unto the Father *but* by me." In Mat. 28: 19, the ordinance of baptism is required to be administered in the name of God, existing in three Persons; why ought *not*, therefore, every form of worship and devotion to be in the same manner? There are a multitude of other passages which need not be cited, where we are required to pray to the Father, and render to him thanks, in the name of and by Jesus Christ, and where Christ is represented as the Mediator and intercessor between God and man—all implying that this is *the* way we are to worship him, and that if it is important that we should regard Christ as our Mediator in *one* form of worship, it is equally important in *every* form. The same may be said of the Holy Spirit, viz. that if it is important

we should remember him as our sanctifier and assistant in *one* act of worship, as many passages teach, it is equally important we should do the same in *every* act. The conclusion, then, is, that God should be worshipped *only* as existing in three Persons.

2. The worship so rendered, is *not in any degree subordinate*, to either Person but equal to each. Some have thought that though we ought to worship God as existing in three Persons; yet our worship should not be *equal* to each Person,—but should *terminate* on the *Father*. That as Christ is only our Mediator, and the Holy Spirit our Assistant, it evidently follows that the worship paid to them, must be subordinate in some degree, at least, to that rendered to the Father. And, moreover, as the Father is greater and sustains a higher office than the Son and Spirit, and as the Son is subject to the Father, and receives all power and authority from him, and can do nothing of himself, without the Father—and as the Son and Spirit proceed from the Father, and are his gift, certainly, if religious worship should be rendered to them *at all*, it must be *far inferior* to that paid to the Father.

Now, however plausible this train of reasoning may at first seem, there are several considerations to show that the conclusion, by no means, follows from the premises.

First. Many passages of Scripture either directly require or plainly imply that our worship to the Persons in the Godhead should, in no case, and in *no degree*, be subordinate to either, but equal to each. In Mat. 28: 19, we are required to render equal honor to the Persons in the Godhead, in the ordinance of baptism,—and if in this, why not in every other? I know many say that the Father is mentioned *first*, in this case, and *therefore*, the honor rendered to him, must be superior to the others. But according to this mode of reasoning, directly the *reverse* may be proved from other passages. In 2 Cor. 13: 14, and 2 Thes. 2: 16, the *Son* is mentioned first. In 1 Pet. 1: 2, where each of the Persons are mentioned, the *Spirit* is *second, and before the Son*. And in Rom. 15: 30, he is also mentioned second, and *before the Father*. The conclusion, then, from these instances, is, not that subordinate worship should be rendered to either, but *equal* to all. The very fact that they are mentioned thus promiscuously by the sacred writers in their devotions, shows that such was their opinion and practice. If they intended to teach that one Person should be regarded as superior to the other, it is difficult to conceive to which they referred.

But there are other classes of texts, which prove the same thing. In one place we are told that whatsoever we ask in the name of the Son, the *Father* will do it, and in another that the *Son* will do it, [John 15: 16, comp. 14: 14.] In one verse we are required to honor the Father, yet in the same we are required to render *equal* honor to the Son, [John 5: 23.] One passage in the Bible says that the Father has a right to work on the Sabbath, being Lord of it; another declares that the *Son* has an equal and the same right, being also Lord of the same, [John 5: 17, comp. Mark 2: 28.] Though the Father is said in one place to forgive sins, yet in another the

Son claims that prerogative as his own, [Mat. 6: 12, 14, 15, comp. Mark 2: 7—12. True, the incredulous Jews thought strange of it, and accused him of blasphemy. Yet he condescended to convince them of the fact, by working a miracle in his own name and authority. In some places it is said that the Father is able to keep his children, that none can pluck them from his hand, [John 10: 29,] that he will raise them from the dead, [John 5: 21,] and give them eternal life, [Luke 12: 32, Mat. 20: 23,] that he raised the Son, [Gal. 1: 1, Eph. 1: 20, 1 Cor. 6: 14,] that he is in the Son, [John 14: 11,] and knoweth him, &c. [Mat. 11: 27, John 10: 15.] Yet in others we are told, that the *Son* also hath power in *himself*, to preserve his children, to raise himself and them from the dead, and to give them eternal life, [John 10: 18, 28, John 2: 19, and 6: 40.] And that he is in the Father, and knows him, in the *same sense*, as the Father is in him, and knows him, [Mat. 11: 27, John 19: 15, and 14: 11.] Now if such language and such representations do not express an equality in the Persons, and, consequently, demand equal worship and adoration from us to them, it is difficult to conceive what language or representations could express it. There are indeed many seeming paradoxes in the passages cited; but the Saviour explains them in John 10: 30, 14: 9, 10, 11, and in a multitude of other places, by saying that they are *one*, not merely in *interest* and *design*, for this may be said of Christians, but in *nature* and *essence*.

I might now proceed to cite various examples of worship, from the Bible, in which saints on earth and in heaven, use the *same language* in worshipping the Son, as in worshipping the Father, without the least intimation of its being used in an inferior sense in either case, so that if subordinate worship is designed to be rendered to one of the Persons—it is impossible to tell which it is.

Secondly. The fact that there can be no *degrees* in religious worship, proves that neither Person should be worshipped subordinately to the other. For if we suppose that subordinate worship is to be rendered in any instance to either, or that our worship should *terminate* on the one and not on the others, we suppose there may be *degrees* in religious worship, which is contrary to the whole tenor of the Bible. If, therefore, it is acknowledged that religious worship should be rendered to the Son and Holy Spirit *at all*, (to deny which, would be to deny that religious worship is required in the Bible, to be paid to any being,) then it must be acknowledged to be equal with that of the Father.

Thirdly. But if it should be admitted that different degrees of religious worship might be rendered to different beings, yet who will say this can be the case in regard to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, who is one and the same Being inseparably connected? It should be remembered they are not *three different* Beings, but *one and the same.* Hence it is often said in the Bible, that when one is honored and glorified the other is also and equally.

Fourthly. Another reason against the subordinate worship of either Person is, that in practice it would be attended with the utmost difficulty and perplexity.

If the Son and Holy Spirit is to be worshipped in *any* degree, it is of the highest importance, that we should know *how much*—for if we render more or less to either than we ought, we shall be guilty. Now as we have no examples of subordinate worship, in the Bible, or precepts requiring it; and as, of course, we are not informed to what *extent* it should be rendered; to practice it, would not only be difficult, but presumptuous. Besides, fact shows that few could be united in such worship, for most of its advocates have disagreed among themselves.

I might proceed to adduce other proofs that the Son and Holy Spirit are always to be worshipped equally with the Father, from the fact that they have the same Divine perfections, that they share equally in the work of Redemption,—that the assistance of each, is always equally necessary to enable us to worship aright, and that for these reasons the fact that one is prior in *office* to the other, is no objection to equal worship. Also from the fact that God will not give his glory to another, or share it with any other than an equal. [Is. 42: 8, and 48: 11, Mat. 4: 10, comp. Rev. 5: 13.] But I proceed to show;

3. That we may address *either person distinctly*, in our prayers for *any* favor that we need. Many in theory, and still more in practice, make it manifest as their belief, that no favors are to be asked of the Son or Holy Spirit *personally*, but that all should be asked of the *Father*, in the name of the Son, and by the assistance of the Spirit: others believe they may be addressed personally, but only to a certain *limited* extent, viz. that of the Holy Spirit no favors are to be sought but renewing and sanctifying grace,—of the Son none but forgiveness,—and all other favors, of course, of the Father. Now whether these sentiments are correct and coincide with the word of God, and the example of primitive Christians, the following will determine.

In regard to the propriety of addressing the *Father* personally, for any favor, without naming the other Persons, as few are inclined to doubt, I will only adduce the example and precept of the Saviour. He as a man thus addressed him, and when teaching others how to pray, directed them to do the same, [see Luke 11: 1—4.] My chief object is to show the propriety of personally applying to *Christ* for any favor, without bringing the other Persons into view, as those who admit this, readily yield their assent that the same is true of the others. In Heb. 1: 6, the angels are required to worship him; and in Phil. 2: 10, 11, every knee in heaven and earth, is required to bow at his name, not in connexion with the Father and Spirit, but *Jesus only*, is mentioned. Is it then unsafe, and a matter of trembling and hesitancy for us to bow at the feet of Jesus alone, and render him the supreme homage of our hearts? One would rather think from these passages, it was the *reverse*—unsafe *not* to do it.

Again. *Supreme love to Christ, and obedience to his commands*, he has said himself, is essential to piety. In one place he says "why call ye me Lord, Lord, *and do not the things which I say?*" And in another, "*If ye love me, keep my commandments.*" In Luke, 14: 26, our love to father, mother, brothers, sisters, houses,

and lands, yea, and our own life also, is required to be as *hatred*, when compared to the love we should exercise for him. May we not then go to him personally in prayer to enable us thus to love and obey him?

Christ is every where, in the New Testament, represented as the object of *faith*. May we not then, with the Apostles, [Luke 17: 5,] go to him personally to "increase our faith?"

He is represented as the object of *trust* and *confidence*. In Ps. 2: 12, that man is called blessed, who puts his trust in him. And in Mat. 12: 21, it is said the Gentiles shall trust in him. Shall we then hesitate to go to him, and unbosom to him our cares and wants?

With the example of the Apostles before us in Acts 1: 24, shall we doubt the propriety of seeking of him *divine guidance and direction* in every time of need?

May we not go to him in *sickness*, who once with a word healed all manner of diseases? [Mat. 4: 24.]

In the greatest *temporal distress*, *trouble and danger*, the disciples of Jesus once went to him, and obtained deliverance, [Mat. 8: 25, 26.] The winds and waves were silent at his voice. May we not do the same?

Once sinners went to him for relief in *spiritual distress*, and in Mat. 11: 28, Jesus requires all such to come to him, and he will give them peace and consolation. To whom else, then, shall we go at such times?

Jesus when on earth claimed to himself the power and prerogative of *forgiving sin*, [Mark 2: 7—12.] Has he since been divested of it, so that we may not now apply to him, for forgiveness?

Paul once prayed to Christ to be delivered from *temptation*, but he, not thinking it best, in that instance, to grant his request, promised him the aid of his own grace and strength to resist and overcome it, [2 Cor. 12: 7—10.] May we not then safely do the same? The same Apostle also thought it not improper to address *Christian Psalmody* to Christ, and to pronounce the *benediction* in his name *alone*, [Col. 3: 16, and Rom. 16: 24.] Is there, then, reasonable ground for us to hesitate to do the same? He, also, looked to Christ for strength to assist him in the work of the *ministry*; and believed his strength alone was sufficient to enable him to do all things, [Phil. 4: 13.] Where else then, shall those go for assistance who are engaged in the same employment?

Christ promised to meet Christians and bless them, wherever they should meet in his name for *prayer*, [Mat. 18: 20.] Shall Christians now hesitate, in such circles, to request him to fulfil that promise?

Finally. If the martyr Stephen, who, while filled with the Holy Ghost, and suffering the agonies of *death*, committed his departing spirit into the hands of his Saviour, and prayed him for admission into his heavenly kingdom, [Acts 7: 59, 60,] may not be accused of idolatry and rashness, then, we, when the period of our dissolution shall arrive, may safely follow his example.

If the instances now adduced, are not sufficient, not only to warrant, but require us to go to Jesus alone with the most unhesitating confidence, at all times and for every favor that we need, and to render him the supreme homage of our hearts,—then I

shall despair of ever having evidence sufficient to require this of me to *any* being.

It may now be expected that I shall proceed to prove that the Holy Spirit may at any time, be addressed for any favor we need; but having proved this true, in regard to the Father and Son, I deem it unnecessary; for all who acknowledge the latter, find no difficulty in admitting the former. I will, however, remark, that though there is no example of distinct and personal worship of the Holy Spirit in the Bible, or precept directly requiring it, yet the inspired writers seem to have considered it as a matter of course that we *should* so do, as they have attributed to him divine personality and perfections. I come now,

4. To show that this *distinct* and *personal* worship, is consistent with the first position, viz. that God should be worshipped *only* as existing in three Persons.—It should be remembered, in the first place, that the Bible can assert nothing inconsistent with itself. If then it asserts (as has been shown) that God can be worshipped only as existing in three Persons, and also gives us a multitude of examples for imitation, of distinct and personal worship, then we must believe it is consistent, though we may not see *how*.

But secondly, as the Persons in the Godhead are so united that they cannot be separated, it follows of course that one implies the whole, although all are not *mentioned*. As when we say the Father is omnipotent, and also the Son and Holy Spirit, when we mean that only one Being is omnipotent; or as when we speak of one of the Persons as omnipotent, when of course we imply the whole. So also when we worship each of the Persons in the Godhead, distinctly, though we may not *conceive* of them in our minds, in any other way than as three perfectly distinct and separate beings, yet if we, in reality, *believe* them to constitute *but one* Being, and that our worshipping one, is in fact worshipping the three, then, our worship will be as acceptable to God, and we shall be as consistent, as though we actually could conceive of them as they really exist.

Though I have now discussed this subject as far as I proposed, I cannot persuade myself to dismiss it, without making a few practical remarks which it naturally suggests.

First. We ought not to make this a *speculative*, but purely a *practical* subject. The moment we attempt to speculate upon it, and to rely on the aid of philosophy in its investigation, we are, at once, lost in obscurity, doubt and perplexity. And no wonder. It lies beyond her reach.—It is high, she cannot attain it. None, but the Infinite Three One Himself, can comprehend it. And if he has told us he does so exist, what higher—what stronger evidence can we ask? Philosophy and unbelief, may, indeed, inquire *how can these things be?* but to whom, or what shall we listen, in opposition to the word of *Jehovah?* All things else may deceive, but his word alone remains true and unerring.

Second. We infer from what has been said, that *it may with propriety be left to our feelings and choice*, whether, in our devotions, we will *mention* all the Persons in the Godhead in connexion, or only one distinctly. If it has been shown, that God

can truly be worshipped only as existing in three Persons, and also that we may consistently with this, address either distinctly, or without mentioning the others, then the inference just mentioned, follows of course. God will be equally honored in either case, provided we really *believe* in his existence in three Persons. We may address the Father, in the name of the Son and by the assistance of the Spirit, i. e. mention them in this manner, *always*, if we please, provided we do not attach, in our minds, *any subordination* to either person. Or we may address either, in our devotions, separately, or *mention* only one, and promiscuously, as our feelings may prompt, though if we follow the example of the Apostles and primitive Christians, as exhibited in the New Testament,—and if we have a right view of ourselves as sinners,—we shall feel constrained to be oftenest at the feet of *Jesus*, as doubtless the experience of Christians, at the present day will testify, when they have had such a view of themselves. This is usually the case with the young convert, the first breathings of his pious soul, are, as it were by *instinct*, directed in prayer to Jesus.

Third. If what has been said is true, there is no danger of worshipping either Person *too much*, or one more than another. Some trembling Christians have had difficulty in their minds in regard to this, fearing lest they should worship one more than another. But as we have seen, there is no real ground for such difficulties. They arise altogether from the want of clear and correct views of the subject.

Fourth. Those who are *unwilling to render any other than subordinate worship* to the Son and Holy Spirit, or who cannot separately address them in their prayers, without doubt and hesitation, greatly dishonor and displease God,—especially is this true in regard to those who profess, in the strongest terms, to believe in their equality with the Father. That there are cases of this kind, facts render it impossible to question, and in proof that they are dishonorable and displeasing to God, nothing need be said.

Finally. Divest the Saviour of his divinity, and tell the sinner he is at best but some superior *angelic* being, and consequently that the supreme worship of him is *idolatry*, and you deprive him of the only refuge to which he can flee, and his only hope of happiness and of heaven. You cut the last cord that suspends him over everlasting burnings,—and tear away the last prop, that sustains his sinking soul.

DEICULTUS.

RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSY.

"I am sensible of the prejudice of many against controversy on religious subjects. But is it possible, in all cases, to avoid it? What is controversy, properly managed, but rational or argumentative discussion of the subjects of religion? —Heat and personal invective, in such disquisitions, are both impertinent and hurtful. But a cool discussion of the doctrines of religion, on the ground of reason and revelation, is undoubtedly, one of the best means of investigating truth, of diffusing the knowledge of it, and of obtaining and giving satisfaction with regard to the difficulties which attend many moral and religious subjects.—To point out the inconsistency and absur-

dity of an erroneous system, and even to set them in the most glaring light, is not at all inconsistent with this mode of discussion."—*Edwards.*

From the London Evangelical Magazine.

THE TWINS.

A FEW years since a man and his wife arrived in the town of M——, as permanent residents. They were young, lately married, and their prospects for futurity were bright and cheering. They purchased a farm in M——, which was then a new country, —and had happily spent two or three years in this situation, when, by a mysterious providence, the young man was called from this world. With his surviving widow, he left two lovely twin infants to deplore a loss which time could not retrieve. The widow sought comfort in vain from the limited circle of her acquaintance. There was no minister of the gospel in that region to direct her to the great source of comfort, nor was there a pious friend who could direct her trembling footsteps to the cross of Jesus. But she went to her Bible, and by the assistance of the Spirit of heaven found that consolation, which a selfish world can neither bestow nor taste. She mourned indeed a husband, who was no more; but she was cheered by the hope that God would protect her and hers. She wept over her innocent babes, and resolved that while she lived, they should never need a mother's care. As they grew up, she endeavoured to teach them the first principles of religion, but they received only her instructions. One week after another rolled away—one Sabbath after another dawned upon the wilderness, but they brought none of their privileges. The wilderness had never echoed with the sound of the church-going bell. The solitary places had never been gladdened by the sound of the footsteps of him who proclaims "glad tidings of great joy." The feeling mother clasped her little boys to her aching bosom, and sighed and wept for the opportunity of taking them by the hand and leading them up to the courts of God. In the days of her childhood she had possessed great advantages, and she mourned that her babes could only receive instruction from her lips. Alas! no missionary came to instruct—to cheer—and to gladden the bosom of her, who, for years, had never heard the whispers of love from the servants of her Saviour. When the little boys were five years old, and before they were old enough to be sensible of their loss, a consumption had fastened on their tender parent, and she was soon encircled in the cold hands of death. She steadily watched the certain issue of her disease, and even in her last moments commended her children to Him who is a "father to the fatherless." A few moments before she expired, she tenderly kissed her little boys, who unconsciously wept on feeling the last grasp of the clay-cold hand of their mother. "It is hard," said she to a neighbour who was present, "it is hard for a mother to leave two such helpless babes without friends, and without any one to protect them; but I leave them in the hands of God, and I *do* believe he will protect them, and my last prayer shall be for my poor destitute orphans." After the death of their mother, they

were received into the house of a neighbour. In less than a year, one of them was stretched beside his mother beneath the sods. About this time a pious lady arrived in the place. She too was an orphan, but was not comfortless. It was her first inquiry how she could do good to the poor villagers around her. During a solitary walk one afternoon, she met the other little boy straggling about the road. He was a beautiful, flaxen headed boy, though exceedingly ragged. The young lady was struck with his appearance, and entered into conversation with him. "What is your name, my little boy?" said she gently.—"James." "Where do you live?" "With widow——, just in the edge of the wood, in that little log house, can't you see it?" "I see it; but is widow ——— your mother?" "No. I had a mother and she loved me. She used to take care of me and my brother John. She gave us clothes, and taught us our prayers and catechism.—Oh! she was a good mother." "But where is your mother?" said the lady soothingly. "Oh! madam, she is dead, do you see the grave yard yonder?" "Yes"—"and the great maple tree which stands in the corner of it?" "Yes, I see it." "Well, my poor mother was buried under that tree, and my brother John lies there too. They were both buried up in the ground, though mother's grave was the deepest. I shall never see them again, never, never, as long as I live. Will you go with me and see the graves?" continued he, looking at the lady with earnestness and simplicity. The short account which the little boy gave of himself, awakened the best feelings of the young lady, and she had been devising some plan to do him good. For the present she declined visiting the grave, but continued to converse with him and gain his confidence. She found him very ignorant, having never been to school; and the instructions of a pious mother, having never been repeated or enforced by example, were nearly forgotten. A Sabbath school had never been established in the place, and whether it was practicable to establish one was doubtful—but she was determined to make the experiment. Accordingly she visited every little cottage in the village, and urged that the children might, the next Lord's day be assembled, and a school formed. A proposal of this kind was new and unpopular. For the first three sabbaths the young lady had no scholars but her little James. But she knew that however faint may be our prospects of doing good at the commencement, we should not be discouraged. The first blow we strike may produce but little effect. The lady was sorry she had so few scholars, but she bent all her efforts to the instruction of the little boy. But in a few weeks, the prejudices of the people began to wear away, and before the summer closed, this school embraced every child whose age would allow it to attend. It was the second summer after the establishment of this school, and after little James had been well acquainted with his Testament and his catechism, that his health began to fail. The good young lady beheld his gradual decay with anxiety, visited him often, and always wept at parting with a pupil so dear. She used often to walk out with him, and to cheer him with her conversation. One pleasant afternoon she led him out by the hand,

and at his request visited the spot where lay his mother and little brother. Their graves were both covered with grass, and on the smaller grave some beautiful flowrets. It was in the cool of a serene summer's day, as they sat by the graves in silence. Neither of them able to speak. The lady gazed at the pale countenance of the lovely boy, upon whose system a lingering disease was preying; while he looked at her with an eye that seemed to say, "I have not long to enjoy your society." Without saying a word he cut a small stick, and measured the exact length of his little brother's grave, and again seated himself by the lady. She appeared sad, while he calmly addressed her. "You see, my dear Miss S——, that this little grave is shorter than mine will be."—She pressed his little white hand within her own, and he continued,—"you know not how much I love you—how much I am obliged to you. Before you taught me, I knew nothing of death—nothing about heaven, or God, or angels. I was a very wicked boy till you met me. I love you much, very much, but I would say something else." "And what would you say," inquired the lady, trying to compose her feelings. "Do you think I shall ever get well?" "Indeed I hope you will—but why ask that question?" "Because I feel I shall not live long—I believe I shall soon die—I shall then be laid beside my poor mother—she will then have her two twins, one on each side of her—But do not cry, Miss S——, I am not afraid to die. You told me, and the Testament tells me, that Christ will suffer little children to come unto him, and though I know I am a very sinful little boy, yet I think I shall be happy, for I love this Saviour who can save such a wicked boy as I am. And I sometimes think I shall soon meet mother and little brother in happiness. I *know* you will come too, won't you? When I am dead I wish you to tell the Sabbath scholars how much I loved them all—tell them they must all die, and may die young; and tell them to come and measure the grave of little James. And then prepare to die." The young lady wept, and could not answer him at that time. But she was enabled to converse with him several times afterwards, on the grounds of his hope, and was satisfied that this little lamb was indeed of the fold of Jesus. She was sitting at his bedside, and with her own trembling hand, closed his lovely eyes as they shut in everlasting slumber. He fell asleep with a smile —without a struggle. The lady was the only sincere mourner who followed the remains of the child to the grave, and while she shed many tears on the sods which covered his lovely form, she could not but rejoice in the belief, that God had permitted her to be the feeble instrument of preparing an immortal spirit for a mansion in the skies.

DAILY RESOLUTIONS OF J. C. LAVATER.

"I WILL never, either in the morning or evening, proceed to any business, until I have first retired at least for a few moments, to a private place, and implored God for his assistance and blessing.

"I will neither do nor undertake any thing, which I would abstain from doing if Jesus Christ were standing visibly before me; nor any thing of which I think it

possible that I shall repent in the uncertain hour of my certain death. I will with the divine aid, accustom myself to do every thing without exception in the name of Jesus Christ, and as his disciple; to sigh to God continually for the Holy Ghost; and to preserve myself in a constant disposition for prayer.

"Every day shall be distinguished by at least one particular work of love.

"Every day I will be especially attentive to promote the benefit and advantage of my own family in particular.

"I will never eat or drink so much as shall occasion me the least inconvenience or hindrance in my business; and between meal times (a morsel in the evening excepted) I will abstain as much as possible from eating and from wine.

"Wherever I go I will pray to God that I may commit no sin there, but be the cause of some good.

"I will never lay down to sleep without prayer, nor, when I am in health, sleep longer than, at most, eight hours.

"I will every evening examine my conduct through the day, by these rules, and faithfully note down in my journal how often I offend against them.

"O God, thou seest what I have written. May I be enabled to read these my resolutions every morning with sincerity, and every evening with joy and the clear approbation of my conscience."

ANECDOTE OF MR. CECIL.

Some years ago, a young girl entered the shop of Mr. B. a bookseller, desiring him to exchange a prayer book, which she brought with her, for a Bible, stating as a reason, that she had lately attended a dissenting meeting where the Bible was used but not the prayer book. The book-seller feeling anxious to meet her wishes, and desirous, at the same time, that she should not forsake the national church of which he was himself a member, gave her a Bible, and bade her keep the prayer book also. Some time after, this girl was taken into the service of Rev. Mr. Cecil. On her first coming into the family, Mr. Cecil inquired if she had a Bible; to which she answered in the affirmative, and told him from whom she had received it. Mr. Cecil was pleased with the circumstance; and finding out Mr. B. recommended him to his friends. During Mr. Cecil's absence from town, however, Mr. B. became involved in serious pecuniary difficulties, and was compelled to give up his business, and return to a mechanical employment which he had learned in his youth. The violent exertion attendant on this occupation occasioned a painful illness; he remained sometime in a hospital, but at length left it, and retired to an obscure lodging, without any adequate means for the support of himself and family. To this place, Mr. Cecil on his arrival in town, with difficulty, traced him. An early interview took place, and Mr. B. having stated his misfortunes, Well, Mr. B., said Mr. Cecil, "what can be done for you?" "Would a hundred guineas be of any service to you?" "I should be truly thankful for such a sum," said B., "it would be of great use to me, but I cannot expect it." "Well," returned Mr. Cecil, "I am not a rich man, and have not got a

hundred guineas to give you, B. but," continued he, putting his hand in his pocket, "I have got one: here it is at your service, and I will undertake to make it a hundred in a few days." Mr. Cecil represented the case to his friends, fulfilled his promise; and the Bible which B. had formerly given to a child, procured the means of once more opening his shop, and affording him a subsistence.—*Chris. Obs.*

APHORISMS.

We should have all our communications with men, as in the presence of God; and with God, as in the presence of men.

A more glorious victory cannot be obtained over another man, than this, that when the injury began on his part, the kindness should begin on ours.

He who receives a favor, should never forget it; he who does one should never lay it up.

Review.

For the Christian Magazine

REVIEW OF TRACTS *published by the American Unitarian Association.*

[Continued from page 159.]

THE next Tract, in the series to be examined, is the "*One Hundred Scriptural Arguments for the Unitarian Faith.*" A most formidable title, surely! And, if titles were a legal substitute for proof, one that must settle the whole question! For who would presume to dispute, or so much as to doubt, in opposition to "one hundred scriptural arguments!" —But since the goodness of a cause depends, not so much upon the number of the arguments adduced in support of it, as upon their soundness; and since arguments denominated scriptural are not always so in reality, nor are always pertinent; we may regard the Tract before us, like every other human performance, as standing upon its own merits, and as being fairly open for examination and remark.

And in looking over its "one hundred scriptural arguments," we find at least *ten*, which have no sort of claim to be thus denominated. They neither contain any passage of Scripture, nor refer to any, but are the mere assertions of the writer. These assertions are some of them sufficiently wide from the truth, and easily susceptible of refutation; but as we have ninety "scriptural arguments" still remaining to be disposed of, we shall readily be excused in suffering them to pass.

Of the ninety remaining arguments, *eighty five* go to prove this merely—that *Christ is, in some sense, distinct from, and inferior to, the Father.* But this point is as essential to Trinitarian theology, as it can be to Unitarian. We firmly believe there is a sense, in which Christ is distinct from the Father, and in which his Father is greater than he; and instead of feeling pinched by the numerous passages which may be urged in proof of this, we feel supported and strengthened by them. Instead of wishing to be rid of these passages, we should feel constrained to contend with any denomination of Christians, who should manifest a disposition to wrest them from us. And if passages of this nature are to be counted arguments in favor of the Unitarian faith;

the writer of the Tract might have increased their number to five hundred, as well as to one.

Of the five arguments still remaining, *one* (the eighty sixth) infers, since Christ was visible while here on earth, and since "no man hath seen God at any time," that Christ was not a divine person; just as if Trinitarians believed, that he, who was, in one sense, "the mighty God, the everlasting Father, and the Prince of Peace," was not, in another, the "child born," and the "Son given"—the visible partaker of flesh and blood. *Two* (the second and eighteenth) insist, from the passages in which the Father is spoken of as the "one God," and "the only true God,"* that there can be no sense in which Christ is God. But a moment's reflection may satisfy any one, that the Father is spoken of as the "one God," and "the only true God," in contradistinction to the *idols*, or pretended *divinities* of the heathen, and not in opposition to him whom we are required to honor "even as we honor the Father." "There be that are *called gods*, whether in heaven or in earth; but to us, there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him."

Of the two arguments not yet noticed, *one* (the fifteenth) is no argument at all, but an attempt at answering the Trinitarian argument derived from the declaration of our Saviour, that he and his Father were one; and the *other* (the seventeenth) has no direct bearing on the subject, as the passage referred to (1 Tim. vi. 15,) does not determine, whether the person spoken of as "the blessed and only Potentate who alone hath immortality," be the Father, the Son, or the Holy Ghost, or more probably the one glorious Being, whom these three equal and divine persons, in their mysterious union, constitute.

We have thus examined—rather summarily it may be supposed, but we think at as great length as they deserve—the famous "one hundred scriptural arguments for the Unitarian faith." *Ten* of them, we have found, are the mere assertions of the writer; *eighty eight* prove nothing to the purpose for which they were adduced; and the *two* remaining are founded and builded upon a mistaken interpretation of the Scriptures.

It would be easy to show, were it worth the time, that some of the arguments, which the writer of this Tract has thought to array against Trinitarianism, are in palpable contradiction to his own sentiments. Take the following as an example. The point to be proved is thus stated at the commencement. Jesus Christ, "*though exalted far above all other created intelligences*, is a being distinct from, inferior to, and dependent on, the Father Almighty." In proof of this point, the fifty eighth argument alleges "that Jesus was made a *little lower than the angels*."* Now it might require another hundred arguments to show how the fact that "Jesus was made a *little lower than the angels*," is proof that, though a creature, "he is exalted *far above all other created intelligences*;" or, in other words, how the fact that he was made *lower* than the angels, is proof that he was made *higher* than the angels.

* John xvii. 3, and 1 Cor. viii. 6.

* We recommend this passage (Heb. ii. 9,) to the particular consideration of those who, rejecting the human nature of Christ, regard him as a supremely exalted creature.

We here dismiss this far famed Tract—which has travelled, we are told, to India, and has been reprinted at the press of Rammohun Roy*—with the remark, that though it may, in some instances, mislead the unthinking and ignorant, it can have no effect upon those, whether Trinitarian or Unitarian, unless indeed it be to disgust them, who are capable of judging of the pertinency and force of scriptural arguments, and who have an enlarged acquaintance with theological subjects.

The *third* Unitarian Tract is entitled a "*Discourse on Human Depravity, by Edmund Q. Sewall.*" The principal object of the Discourse is to disprove the doctrine of "*native hereditary depravity;*" but "before entering on this main design," the author "suggests some remarks on *total depravity*, which gives us," he says, "as false a view of the *degree* of sin found among men, as the other does of its *origin.*" In our review, we shall invert this order of procedure, reserving what we have to offer on the subject of *total depravity*, till the last.

In entering upon a consideration of the other part of the subject, it is of prime importance to determine what Mr. Sewall *means* by "native hereditary depravity." And to preclude all danger of misrepresenting him, it will be safest to allow him to speak for himself.

Mr. S. describes the doctrine of native depravity as holding and teaching, that God "has sent us into life, with our souls in such a state, that we are *utterly incapable* of the very purpose for which alone we have souls," (p. 21,)—that he "has made us with a nature which is *incapable* of goodness, and then inflicts endless torments on us, for not being good," p. 28,)—that "we sinned sixty centuries before we began to live;" and "are guilty of that, which, but for history, we never should have known," (p. 22,)—that "uncounted millions are laid under the wrath and curse of God forever, in consequence of a single offence of a man, who lived ages before they were born," (p. 22,) that "having given us a nature entirely corrupt, incapable of good, and prone to all evil, God placed us in this world, with a command to do, what he knows we cannot do; and then condemns us to eternal wo, for doing that which he knows we cannot help doing," (p. 27,)—that "we come into life with a fixed character, and are, at the first, decidedly, entirely, and for aught we can do *incurably* wicked,"—that "we deserve hell, as soon as we are born, and can never deserve more"—that "our doom is decided at the outset, and cannot be the consequence of a trial which it precedes," (p. 29,)—that "all men are liable to eternal wo, as soon as they come into the world," (p. 31,)—that "we can lose nothing," in our state of trial, "since all was lost at the beginning; and can gain nothing, since all we do prior to regeneration is done in vain,"—that "we are not made worse, by the neglect of moral means, for it is impossible to be more than totally depraved; and are not improved by the use of them, for that would detract from the sovereignty of divine grace, to which, as the sole unaided cause, all change for the better is attributed," (p. 30,)—that "man is, by his nature, *utterly unable* to observe" the divine precepts, (p. 33,)—that "the sins of men" proceed

* See Chris. Examiner, Vol. iii. p. 522.

"from a cause, which God alone could have hindered; and which God alone can remove," (p. 27,)—"that God gave us, at first, a ruined nature, and sent us, helpless and abandoned, into a waste howling wilderness, with no capacity to do good, and condemned to woes eternal for doing evil," (p. 42,)—that "the judgment is already completed, when we begin the race of life, and cannot be reversed by all we may perform"—and that "a sentence was passed, ages ago, on the whole race, by which we are liable to the pains of hell," (p. 34.)

Such is a specimen of the language in which Mr. S. describes the doctrine of native depravity; and such is the doctrine, against which he has urged six long and labored arguments. It is little to our purpose to examine his arguments, or to inquire whether he has refuted the doctrine, or not. Suffice it to say, that it is such a doctrine (in his statement of it) as we do not believe, and as we do not think any body else ever did believe. It is a creature of his own fancy—a "man of straw," or of some worse material, of his own creation; and if he has succeeded in destroying it, he has saved us the trouble, and is entitled to all the glory which can result from such a conquest.

In reviewing this part of Mr. Sewall's labors, two things suggest themselves as matter of regret. The one is, that he has allowed himself to publish such statements, as the real sentiments of the Orthodox. If he knows our sentiments he has wilfully misrepresented them; and if he does not know them, he ought to have informed himself, before he attempted to describe and refute them. As the matter stands, he has done us great injustice; or rather, he *would* have done us great injustice, were it not that his representations are so horribly extravagant, that no sober person, who knows us, will be likely to give them the least credit.

But we urge farther, as matter of still more serious regret, that Mr. S. has allowed himself to write and publish with such revolting levity, on some of the most fearful truths of our holy religion. He customarily speaks of "endless torments"—of "woes eternal"—of "the wrath and curse of God forever"—and of "the pains of hell," very much in the style of bar-room eloquence, and in a manner altogether unbecoming, we do not say a minister of Christ, but a believer in divine revelation. He ought to have known, that these are awful subjects—that they are so regarded by all the inspired writers—and that to treat them with his sort of lightness and banter, is to trifle with the most solemn things. —And these charges, which we feel compelled to urge against the writer of this Tract, lie with an almost equal weight against those who have published, and who are engaged to circulate it. It comes before us, not on the responsibility of an individual merely, but of the American Unitarian Association; and it is so highly valued by "the Executive Committee" of that body, that they consented to give *thirty five dollars* for the liberty of publishing it.* They will not complain, therefore, that we lay the injustice of its representations, and the irreverence of its language, in part at least at their own door.

In entering upon a considera-

* See First Annual Report, p. 5.

tion of *total depravity*, as treated by Mr. Sewall, we have to repeat the charge, already urged, of *misrepresenting* the sentiments of his opponents. He speaks of total depravity as implying, that all the *external conduct* of unrenewed men is, in itself, improper and vicious. This doctrine "excludes every good feeling, desire, purpose, and *action*, and makes the character of mankind consist solely of bad dispositions, passions, and *deeds*." From the day of their birth, they "have had in their minds nothing pure, and in their *conduct* nothing right," (p. 4.)—Now the believers in total depravity do not represent the subject after this manner. They readily admit, that the conduct of sinners is, in many instances, outwardly virtuous. They may be, not only just and honest, but kind and generous. They may be good neighbors, good citizens, and good friends. And the objection to them, in such instances, is not so much to what they are externally, as internally—not so much to what they are in the sight of men, as to what they are in the sight of God, and to what they would be in their own sight, if they were spiritually enlightened. Our Saviour describes the Pharisees as appearing "*beautiful without*," while within, they were wholly unclean; and the total depravity of sinners now does not imply that they may not, in some instances, appear decent, or even "*beautiful, without*."

Mr. S. farther speaks of total depravity, as implying that sinners are "utterly *incapable*" of exercising holiness. They have "no capacity to do good"—are "incapable of goodness"—are "utterly unable to observe" divine precepts, &c.—Now this representation of the doctrine of depravity, we wholly disavow. Sinners are in no sense "incapable of goodness." They are the subjects of no natural inability to be holy. For if they were, they would have lost their moral nature—have ceased to be moral agents—and would be equally incapable of sin. The fact that they are sinners, shows that they are capable of sinning; and if they are capable of sinning, they are capable of doing their duty.

Mr. S. urges but two arguments against total depravity; the one derived from *analogy*, and the other from *observation*.—Mankind, he says, "are not totally any thing." Saints are not "totally pure;" and consequently sinners are not totally depraved. "Some are wise; but not always, nor in all things. Some are timorous generally; yet, on an occasion, can be bold as lions," (pp. 5, 6.) But arguments of this nature are least of all to be trusted. Analogies such as these lay no sure foundation for the inference intended to be derived from them. They may serve to illustrate and enliven a subject; but are of little use, in establishing or disproving a disputed doctrine. They are of absolutely no weight, in opposition to the plain declarations of Scripture.

In opposing the doctrine of total depravity, Mr. S. appeals to the universal *observation* of men. "Where," says he, "is the being, on the face of the earth, who has done nothing but sin; whose every act has been wicked, and all his thoughts, emotions, and desires corrupt? You cannot find such a being; this may be the description of a devil, but not of a man," (p. 4.) The point at issue between Mr. S. and his opponents, is not of a character to be determined by an ap-

peal like this. It is not of a nature to be submitted to universal observation. If it respected chiefly the outward conduct of men, the one party affirming and the other denying, that their conduct was all externally vicious; it might perhaps be decided in this way. But this, we have shown, is not the case. We no more believe, than Unitarians do, that all the conduct of unrenewed men is externally vicious. Much, that numbers of this class do, is in appearance proper; and were their hearts as holy, as their lives are useful, they would be well entitled to the appellation of saints. The mistake of Mr. S., on this point, is a great one, and it has greatly misled him, in his views and reasonings on the subject of depravity.

There is another thing which has probably deceived him, as we think it does most Unitarians in estimating the amount of human transgression—*they do not know what sin is.* They will, of course, regard this as an arrogant conclusion; but it has not been formed without long and mature deliberation; and we think it not uncharitable, as it helps to account for their otherwise unaccountable blindness on the subject of sin—*they do not know what sin is.* The writer of the Tract, already reviewed, entitled "*The Faith once Delivered to the Saints,*" has the following sentiment relative to this subject: man, "on entering life, is neither virtuous nor vicious, neither holy nor sinful; but possesses such *powers*, as, when developed, will render him one or the other, according to the objects to which they become attached, and the habits which they form. These powers are *reason* and *conscience*, which approve and lead to goodness; and the *passions* and *appetites*, which incline to self-indulgence and sin." His "*trial consists principally in the struggle for mastery between these two parts of his constitution,*" (p. 4.) According to this view, every sin implies a *triumph* of the appetites and passions over the dictates of reason and conscience. But if this is an adequate view of sin, then no decent man can accuse himself of being very sinful. He may on some occasions have been led too far by his appetites and passions, and swerved a little from the line of duty; but his character, in the general, he is constrained to regard as pure and holy.—But how different is this view of sin, from that given in the Scriptures? "*Sin is a transgression of the law.*" What then is the law? "*Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart, with all thy soul, with all thy strength, and with all thy mind.* And *thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. On these two commandments, hang all the law and the prophets,*" Mat. xxii. 37. Here then is the rule, by which we are to regulate all our moral exercises and feelings; and by which we are to *measure* and *try* ourselves, if we would estimate the amount of our holiness, or our sin. But measured by this rule, how many who now pride themselves on their supposed virtues, would be found fearfully wanting! Measured by this rule, strictly and faithfully applied, how many men of decent exterior, would find that they had never possessed one holy affection! How many would find, that they had always loved themselves better than God—that they had been more concerned for their own credit, interest, and happiness, than they had for his glory—and

consequently that their hearts were entirely sinful. They could not accuse themselves of suffering appetite and passion to triumph often over reason; but they could and must accuse themselves of being continually selfish, and on this account of being continually sinful. We repeat it, therefore, as a principal reason why Unitarians make so false an estimate of human transgression—*they do not know what sin is.* And being ignorant of this, they cannot be sensible of the fearful extent, to which themselves and others are contaminated with it.

Mr. S. admits, at least by implication, that the Scriptures afford some countenance to the doctrine of total depravity; but adds, "there are two very obvious principles of interpretation, which ought to be applied to the passages thus employed, which remove at once all pretence for using them in evidence of such a doctrine. 1. What is declared in universal terms is not always to be received without limitation. 2. All which was true of the moral condition of particular persons, communities, or generations, may not be true of us," (pp. 7, 9.)—The question requiring to be decided, in regard to these rules of interpretation, does not respect so much their *propriety*, as their *application;* for if all sects and denominations may avail themselves of them, as often as their exigencies or their convenience render necessary, it is plain that no point, which is at all disputed, can ever again be determined by a reference to the Bible. For instance, the Scriptures assure us, that we "all are of the dust, and *all turn to dust again.*" But it may be said, on the other hand, "What is declared in universal terms is not always to be received without limitation; and all which was true of former generations may not be true of us;—there is no certainty that *we* shall not live forever."—The Apostle directs, "*Let all things be done decently and in order.*" But the advocates of disorder and confusion may say, "What is declared in universal terms is not always to be received without limitation; and all which was true of particular persons, or communities, in former times, may not be true of us;—the direction of the Apostle makes not at all against us."—These instances are adduced to show, that however just may be the principles of interpretation suggested by Mr. Sewall, we need some *rule*, by which to apply them. And, happily, the rule we so much need is a very obvious one. "What is declared in universal terms," is to be received in universal terms; and what is declared "of particular persons, communities, or generations," is to be regarded as applicable to all persons, communities, or generations, *unless when limited by the connexion, by other parts of Scripture, or by the nature of the subject.* The propriety of this rule we presume will not be disputed. The question then is, 'What necessity for limiting the numerous and various universal terms, in which the Scriptures set forth the doctrine of depravity?' And truly we know of no necessity, except what results from the exigencies of the Unitarian hypothesis. The connexion of the passages involves none; and none arises from other parts of Scripture; and none arises from the nature of the subject—unless indeed it can be shown, that the doctrine of total depravity is a palpable absurdity. Hence, on the fairest principles

of interpretation, the universal terms, in which the Scriptures set forth this important doctrine, must stand; and it is believed they establish it, beyond reasonable dispute.

We have no time to go into a labored argument from the Scriptures in proof of total depravity; and yet we can hardly satisfy ourselves, without furnishing some specimens of the language of inspiration on the subject.

A certain class of men are customarily spoken of by the sacred writers, as the unjust, the unrighteous, the ungodly, the unholy, the unbelieving. But what less do these negative epithets imply, than a *destitution* of holy affections?

The same class are represented as being spiritually *blind*, and *deaf*, and *dead*. "Hear, ye *deaf*, and look, ye *blind*, that ye may see." "You hath he quickened, who *were dead* in trespasses and sins." These representations necessarily teach us, that as the blind are destitute of sight, the deaf of hearing, and the dead of life; so unrenewed men are *destitute of holiness*, which is spiritual life.

The *declarations* of Scripture, in support of the sentiment under consideration, are numerous and explicit. Before the flood, "God looked upon the earth, and behold it was corrupt; for *all flesh had corrupted his way upon it.*" Immediately after the flood, the declaration is repeated, "*The imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth.*" Again it is said of the human family, "They are all gone aside; they are altogether become filthy; there is none that doeth good, no, *not one.* None understand; none seek after God; all are gone out of the way; all are become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, *not one.*" "The wicked are estranged from the womb; they go astray as soon as they be born." "The whole world lieth in wickedness." "The heart of the sons of men is *full of evil*," and "*fully set* in them to do evil." "*Every imagination* of the thoughts of his heart is only evil continually." "The heart is deceitful above all things, and *desperately wicked.*" "The carnal mind is *enmity against God;* it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." "I know you, that *ye have not the love of God in you.*" "Ye are of your father, the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do." "Being abominable, disobedient, and to every good work reprobate."*

We have another argument, which we deem conclusive, derived from the *distinction*, every where recognised in the Scriptures, between the righteous and the wicked. The *fact* of this distinction none pretend to dispute; and the *ground* of it is as evident as the fact. While the Gospel requires the highest attainments in holiness, its gracious promises are extended to those who have made but the *lowest* attainments. "The bruised reed shall not be broken, nor the smoking flax be quenched." "Whosoever shall give unto one of these little ones a *cup of cold water only*, in the name of a disciple, verily I say unto you, he shall in no wise lose his reward." The moment the prodigal *began* to return, his father was prepared to meet him. When the thief on the cross put forth his *first* exercise of true repentance, he was

* Gen. vi. 12, and viii. 21. Rom. iii. 10—12. Ps. lviii. 3. 1 John v. 19. Ecc. ix. 3, and viii. 11. Gen. vi. 5. Jer. xvii. 9. Rom. viii. 7. John v. 42, and viii. 44. Tit. i. 16.

immediately forgiven, and became an heir of the grace of life. And so it has been in all periods since —so it is now. Persons belong to the class of sinners, till their hearts are melted, and they *begin* to exercise holy affections; from which moment they become the objects of divine complacence, and are numbered with the saints. But if it is the ground of distinction between saints and sinners, that the former class have *some* holy affections; then the latter class have *none*. They are absolutely *destitute of holiness*, and consequently *all their moral exercises are sinful.*

Mr. S. closes his remarks on total depravity by insisting on the evil consequences of "magnifying what is bad in human character," and "of exaggerating one's own sins," (p. 12,) but as we are not conscious of doing either of these, we can take no part of his reproofs or warnings to ourselves. Indeed the evil of which he complains, so far at least as relates to the views which persons customarily take of their own sins, we do not believe requires correction. They may be too unsparing in their censures of others—even *Unitarians* may; or they may talk extravagantly respecting themselves; but we do not believe that persons are in any danger of regarding sin as a greater evil than it is, or of regarding themselves as more vile and sinful than they appear in the sight of God. So far from this, all their danger, we apprehend, is on the other side. They are in danger of "thinking themselves something, when they are nothing;" and of fancying that they are spiritually "rich, and increased with goods," when they are "wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked." Could Mr. S. but see himself, for one hour, in the glass of God's holy law, and experience the sensations of the great Apostle, when the commandment came home with power to his conscience, and sin revived, and he died; his views of himself would be materially changed. They would be so changed, we have no doubt, that he would wish his "Discourse on Human Depravity" to be blotted forever from the page of existence.

Missionary Intelligence.

From the Missionary Herald.

OSAGE INDIANS.

THE following description of the Osages of the Missouri, is by the Rev. William F. Vaill, superintendent of one branch of the mission to that tribe.

Condition of their Females.

AMONG the Osages, a plurality of wives is allowed. Each husband, if he prove himself to be a man of character, is entitled to all the sisters of the same family, by the same mother. In marrying the oldest, or first wife, they have great ceremonies, such as processions, feasting, firing, displaying the United States' colors, &c. And *she* is *the wife*, or the *best beloved*. The rest fall into the rank of wives, as a matter of course, when they become of suitable age. There is, indeed, a good degree of affection between the parties, but always attended with a spirit of servitude and fear on the part of the women. And their condition is truly degraded; for while the men are reclining at their ease in their camps, smoking, or telling stories, or engaged in the sport of war, or of hunting; the females have to build their houses, plant their corn, dress the skins, transport the baggage, and wood, and water, and bear many a heavy burden. Instead of one day of rest in seven, they have not one from their marriage

until death. It is one unceasing round of servitude and drudgery. And shall it be always thus? Shall their daughters be trained to servitude only? *No*—is the response of every female breast. Let us send them the Gospel, that they too may become respected, and useful, and happy.

Sufferings.

Some seem to suppose the Indians are so hardy, that they are incapable of suffering. I have taken notice of this; and I see, that the Indian feels pain and sorrow, as well as other men. When he travels over the bleak plains, amid the rains and the cold of January, with only a single blanket to cover him by day, and make his bed at night; then it is that he suffers by the cold. When his family is without food, and his gun misses fire, and the deer leaps away—? perhaps the only deer he has seen for many hours,—then it is he suffers by hunger.

And in sickness, they greatly suffer, for want of suitable medicine and care. They have doctors: but these doctors are only miserable conjurors, who, in their applications, occasion more pain than they relieve.

Their principal remedy for almost all kinds of diseases, is cupping. The perforations are made by the point of a large hunting-knife sharpened on a stone. Then the small end of a Buffalo horn is applied, and the blood drawn out by sucking with the mouth.

And they have another still more painful operation. The limbs are punctured over in stripes and checks, till the blood gushes out. The object is, by means of a composition of green powder, to imprint durable marks which shall designate the person as virtuous and honorable. But the poor patient suffers exceedingly, from the consequent swelling, and inflammation.

I will mention another instance. A father sat in sadness on the floor of his lodge. I knew not the cause, till he opened his blanket, and shewed his infant emaciated to skin and bones. He sat expecting it would die. Our physician gave the child some simple medicine, and we left the village. Two years after, I happened to enter the same lodge, and the father called a little playful child, and said, to my surprise, "This is the child your doctor cured."

In their wars, they suffer much for want of medical and surgical aid, and much more, by that universal tremor and distress, which fills their minds, and agitates even their little children, lest their enemies should fall upon them in some defenceless hour.

Mourning for the Dead.

Another scene arises to our view. It is that of a son in the dying agonies. The wretched mother is now in the deepest distress. She cries, and howls, and tears her hair, and smites upon her breast, and wrings her hands. Then, for a moment, she ceases, until the conjurer has done his last office; which is, to paint the face of the dying youth, that it may be known in the other world to what clan he belongs, and that he may please his God, and be accepted by him. The young man dies. It is seen that he is gone. And now the lamentations of surviving friends increase seven-fold. And when one company of mourning women is exhausted, another comes, and takes up and prolongs the sad lamentation. Then they carry forth the dead, wrapped in the skin of a buffalo, lay him upon the earth, and raise over him a mound of earth or stone. From this time the father may be seen sitting by the side of the mound, day after day, fasting—his hair growing long—his face covered with earth. And so intent is he upon his loss, that he sees not the strangers, that pass by him into the town, though there is no event which attracts more attention from the Indians generally, than the approach of white people.

But this man is in sorrow. And he cries to his departed son: "My son! you make me unhappy—you are not with me—I must hunt and go to war alone." Then raising his voice to his God, he says, "My God, have pity on me, my son is gone, I am poor, pity me, help me to go to war, and secure the scalps of mine enemies, that I may feast and make my heart glad again."

It has been the custom of these people, and is still, not to cease mourning till they have sacrificed some enemy. Many of their war excursions against the Pawnees, and indeed *most* of them, are to comfort some one that mourns, by preparing the way for a war feast.

Religion.

Whither goes the spirit of the dead? The Osage cannot tell you. No land of promise, no heaven of pure delight,

rises before the dim vision of an Indian. All that he sees, is a dark and narrow land, a land of shadows and of ghosts. He sees something beyond the grave, but he sees it not distinctly. He knows not what sort of life it is. He rather conjectures it is something like the present.

So he sets a dish of food beside the deceased, and gives back his hunting or war implements. And if it be some brave man, they say, "Let him have his favorite horse, or he will be restless in his grave." So they shoot down his horse by the grave-side.

They have no idea of *one great invisible Spirit*. Tell them of such a being, and they will triumphantly inquire, "Who is he? Where is he? I want to see him. Show him to me, and I will believe. Is he like my shadow? Is he like my breath? Is he like wind? What is he like?" Ask them how many gods they worship, and they will never put up less than four fingers, and say, *Meh Woh-kun-dah*, "The sun is God;" *Me-um-pah Woh-kun-dah*, "The moon is God;" *Greh Woh-kun-dah*, "Thunder is God;" *Moi-neh-kah Woh-kun-dah*, "The earth is God." Others will name five, and others six, and others seven, or eight.

Morning Prayers.

These commence before the break of day. They rise and cover their faces with earth. Then go forth into the field round about the village, and sitting down on the ground, offer their prayers. And you may hear hundreds, at the same time, all praying aloud in different directions. And the God to whom they pray is some imaginary god, like the sun, moon, &c.

I have sometimes seen them pray standing. I once saw the old chief stand and pray, first to the east, and then to the west, then to the north, then to the south, as though God was in one direction, or the other.

Their prayers are always excited by some loss, as of a friend, or favorite animal; or by some trouble, as sickness, hunger, want; and the earnestness of their prayers shows that they are sensible of trouble, as well as other men.

The religious worship in which the Osages abound, makes them truly an interesting people.

Ceremonies.

They eat not, except they wash their hands and face. Sometimes in their trouble they determine to fast till the sun goes down; at other times the vow is for a part of the day. If you invite them to eat, your invitation must be seconded by a bowl of water, or it will be of no use. They have a custom in smoking, which is quite significant. The first whiff they offer to their god, with a prayer, which may be literally translated thus:—"Tobacco, Tobacco, I smoke to thee, god; give me a good path, make me a good warrior."

The great religious ceremony of the Osages, shall be communicated at another time. WM F. VAILL.

Obituary Notices.

From the Missionary Herald.

DEATH OF NICHOLAS VLASOPOLOS.

DIED, on the 7th of March, in Monson, Mass. at the house of the Rev. Simeon Colton, Principal of the Academy at that place, NICHOLAS VLASOPOLOS, aged 21 years.

This young man was one of the eleven Greeks, who had come to this country for the purpose of obtaining an education under the care and patronage of the Board. He arrived in Boston in June last, and, in company with one of his companions, was sent to the Academy in Monson, where some of the other youths had previously pursued their preparatory studies.

He was a native of Ithaca, an island which is under British protection, and enjoyed privileges, of course, which have long been cruelly denied to very many of his nation. His relatives being concerned in mercantile transactions, he for a time filled the office of clerk to his father, who commanded a ship, of which his uncle was the owner. He thus visited the principal ports of the Levant, and the Black Sea. Happening to be at Smyrna, when Mr. King was about sending Perdicari and Prassus to America, he determined to accompany them, if in his power, though he had previously resolved on pursuing his education in Italy. America seemed so distant, that it was with reluctance his friends consented

to his proposal. His uncle paid his passage, gave him a hundred dollars in advance for his education, and engaged to allow him the same sum annually, while he remained in the United States.

Mr. Colton remarks of him, that "his proficiency as a scholar, during the few months he was able to study, was such as to do honor to himself, and afford no ordinary indication of future eminence and usefulness: and with truth may it be said of him, that he was a young man of amiable disposition, correct morals, dignified deportment, and the strictest integrity. He was ardently attached to his country, and took the deepest interest in whatever concerned its welfare."

His health was first observed to decline near the close of the autumn, and it continued steadily to decline till his death. His disease appeared first to be on the liver, but subsequently assumed a pulmonary character; and almost before his case was known to be critical, he became too weak to allow of removal to a milder climate.

For sometime before coming to this country, the attention of Vlasopolos had been directed towards religious truth, and his reliance on the rites and ceremonies of the Greek church had considerably diminished, though he never renounced that communion. When at Odessa, in one of his voyages, he obtained a copy of the New Testament in Modern Greek, which he read with much diligence. He had, also, a Bible, in the Italian language, which received daily attention. In addition to this, the instructions of Mr. King were never forgotten: and from his first arrival in this country, he was constant and serious in his attention on the worship of the sanctuary.

His prevailing habit of thought and feeling, during his sickness, was such as to inspire hope in respect to his present condition: and it is a satisfaction to know, that when in the certain prospect of death, he saw no reason, on the whole, to regret his coming to this country.

His distant friends will mourn, that he died in a land of strangers: but their grief will be alleviated, when they are assured, that, by those who were around him in his sickness, the offices of friendship were all discharged with affectionate assiduity.

DEATH OF GEORGE TAMOREE.

GEORGE TAMOREE, a native of the Sandwich Islands, died on the third of May last. His death was sudden, and was occasioned by the influenza which then prevailed through those Islands. He was the son of the late Tamoree, king of Tauai, was educated in the Foreign Mission School at Cornwall, and was one of the five native youths who sailed with the first missionaries to the Sandwich Islands in 1819.

DEATH OF MRS. TEMPLE.

WE have to communicate the afflictive intelligence of the death of Mrs. TEMPLE, the wife of Rev. Daniel Temple of the Palestine Mission. She died at Malta, Jan. 15th. A full account of her sickness and death has been forwarded, but has not yet arrived. In a short note just received from Mr. Temple, he remarks—"In this event the hand of the Lord has indeed touched me. Her sickness and death were accompanied by the most consoling circumstances, on the one hand, and on the other, by circumstances exceedingly painful. She died *in* the Lord, and full of faith; but I am left to pursue my pilgrimage alone with four little ones, in a strange land. My heart is sorrowful, but it is not disconsolate. Though the Lord cause grief, yet will he have compassion. When I can look up to Him, I am lightened, but when I look in any other direction, all is dark and comfortless."

DEATH OF MRS. JUDSON.

Rev. Mr. Yates of the English Baptist Mission at Calcutta, has recently arrived in Boston, and brought letters which announce the death of Mrs. JUDSON, the wife of Rev. Dr. Judson, missionary in the Burman empire. Mrs. Judson died at Amherst, a town lately founded by the English, about the 24th or 25th of October last, after an illness of a month. When this event happened, Dr. Judson was at Ava, with the British Commissioners, acting as their interpreter, and endeavoring to obtain from the emperor a free toleration of the Christian religion throughout his dominions.

To CORRESPONDENTS.—'Alius Juvenis,' and 'F.' are received.

THE

CHRISTIAN MAGAZINE.

VOL. IV. JULY, 1827. No. 7.

For the Christian Magazine.

ENDLESS PUNISHMENT.

It is the opinion of some, that there will be no punishment beyond the grave. It is the opinion of others, that the punishment of those who die in their sins, will be of temporary duration. The former of these opinions it is not my present object to examine. It is simply with the opinion of those, who admit the idea of a temporary punishment of the wicked in the future world, that I am at present concerned. And, in opposition to this latter opinion, it is my object to show, that, in the strictest sense of the term, the future punishment of the wicked will be endless. In the description of the process and result of the general judgment, which is contained in the twenty fifth chapter of Matthew, we are told, that, "before Christ shall be gathered all nations, and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats: and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left." To those on his left hand, Christ will say; "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels. And these," it is added, "shall go away into everlasting punishment."

The opinion has been advanced, that the separation between the sheep and the goats, at the final judgment, will be a separation, —not between the righteous and the wicked,—but, between sinners and their sins,—that sinners will be placed on the right hand, but their sins, on the left,—that their sins will "go away into everlasting punishment," but their persons "into life eternal." But this opinion is stamped with all the marks of an absurdity. For, it supposes it possible for sin to exist by itself, separate from the sinner. A sin, however, is a personal act. We cannot conceive of its existence, independently of its action. To feel the absurdity of the opinion, that is now the subject of remark, let us read a part of Christ's description of the general judgment in accordance with it. 'Then shall he say to them on his left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed *sins*, into everlasting punishment. For, I was an hungered, and ye, *sins*, gave me no meat; I was thirsty, and ye, *sins*, gave me no drink; I was a stranger, and ye, *sins*, took me not in; naked, and ye, *sins*, clothed me not; sick, and in prison, and ye, *sins*, visited me not.' If, then, the theory before us is absurd, it will follow, that it will be individual persons of the human race, who, at the close of the final judgment, will "go away into everlasting punishment."

Here I am met with the critical remark, that the term, "*everlasting*," in this passage, does not necessarily signify endless duration. But, before examining this remark, it may be proper to adduce a few additional passages of a similar character. "Who shall be punished with *everlasting destruction* from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." "To whom the mist of darkness is reserved *forever*." "To whom is reserved the blackness of darkness *forever*." "And the smoke of their torment ascendeth up *forever and ever*." "And, again, they said, Alleluia; and her smoke rose up *forever and ever*." "And the devil, that deceived them, was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night *forever and ever*." As it respects the words, *everlasting*, *eternal*, *forever*, and the phrase, *forever and ever*, contained in the passages which have been adduced, the best critics acknowledge, that, in the original, they primarily signify a strictly endless period of duration;—and that they are used to signify a limited period of duration, only when used in a figurative, subordinate sense. The same is true respecting the Greek word, rendered by the English words,—*everlasting and eternal*,—as it is used in classic writers. In the writings of Plato, Aristotle, Plutarch, and the best Greek authors generally, it has been proved by a distinguished critic to signify an absolutely endless period of duration. And to signify this, he says, they have no better word in their language. It is an acknowledged rule of interpretation, that the meaning of the words and phrases in question must be determined by the nature of the subjects, to which they are applied. When, as in a few instances, these terms are applied to things in their own nature temporary, we naturally understand them to signify a limited period of duration. For example. The mountains and the hills are said to be everlasting. In this case, our knowledge of the temporary existence of the mountains and hills leads us to conclude, that the term—*everlasting*—is applied to them in a figurative, limited sense. But the same rule of interpretation will lead us to conclude, that the future punishment of the wicked will be endless. The word, *everlasting*, is used to represent the duration of future punishment. The subject, in relation to which that term is used, is the soul of man. But the human soul is absolutely eternal in its existence. Is it not, then, in view of the rule of interpretation that has been stated, a fair conclusion, that the future punishment of the wicked will be strictly eternal?

It is another acknowledged rule of interpretation, that the signification of the terms—*everlasting*, and *eternal*—is to be determined by the connexion in which they are used. Let us, then, apply this rule to the case before us. The duration of the future happiness of the righteous on the one hand, and the duration of the future misery of the wicked on the other, are both brought into view in the same passage of Scripture. "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal." The terms—*everlasting*, and *eternal*—in this passage, are both translated from one and the same word in the original. Why are they not, then, as used in

this connexion, to be regarded as synonymous terms? It cannot be reasonably supposed, that Christ would have used a certain word in a limited sense, and, in the same verse, and with the same breath, without giving any intimation of his design to do it, would have used the same word in a sense infinitely different. But it will not be doubted, that, when he said,—"The righteous into life eternal,"—he used the word rendered *eternal*, to signify a strictly endless period of duration. How, then, can it be reasonably doubted, whether he used the same original word to signify a strictly endless period of duration, when, in the former part of the same verse, he said,—"These shall go away into everlasting punishment?"

The Greek phrase, rendered —*forever and ever*—is used eighteen times in the New Testament. In fifteen instances, it is used to represent the continuance of the perfections and government of God. In these instances it is, therefore, obviously used to signify endless duration. In one instance, it is used to represent the continuance of the reign of the righteous. Hence, in this instance, it is also used to signify endless duration. In the two remaining instances, it is used to represent the continuance of the punishment of the devil, of the beast, of the false prophet, and of those of mankind, who worship the beast and his image. It is, therefore, probable, in the proportion of sixteen to two, that in these two instances, as in the former sixteen, the phrase—*forever and ever*—is used to signify an absolutely interminable period of duration.

The texts concerning the sin against the Holy Ghost, are a clear proof of the eternity of future punishment. "The blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. Whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come. He, that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost, hath never forgiveness." Now, the Gospel rejects every idea of the salvation of men without the forgiveness of their sins. Their sins must be pardoned, or they cannot be saved. Those, then, who commit the unpardonable sin, cannot be saved, and must, consequently, endure an endless punishment.

What Christ said concerning "the son of perdition," is a clear proof of the eternity of future punishment. "Woe to that man, by whom the son of man is betrayed: *good* were it for that man, if he had never been born." Let Judas be miserable for millions and millions of ages, and then be received to heaven, and it will be infinitely good for him to have been born. The period, during which he will be miserable, will be but as a moment, in comparison with a subsequent eternity of blessedness in heaven. It is repeatedly said concerning the lost in hell, that, "their worm dieth not, and their fire is not quenched." How, then, can they be happy? So long as "their worm dieth not, and their fire is not quenched," they must necessarily be miserable. But their worm will never die, nor will their fire be ever quenched. The future punishment of the wicked will, consequently, be endless.

But it is said, that it would be unjust for God to inflict upon sinners an endless punishment.

How does this appear? From his own language, fairly inter-

preted, it appears, that he has actually threatened to inflict endless punishment upon finally impenitent sinners. But this he surely would not have done, if it would be unjust for him to carry his threatening into execution. The moral perfection of his character forbids him to issue any threatenings, the execution of which would be inconsistent with retributive justice. It will, I presume, be admitted, that God may justly continue to punish the wicked in the future world, so long as they will *deserve* to be punished. It is, then, pertinent to inquire, whether they will not *deserve* to be punished, so long as their *guilt* will remain, and whether their *guilt* will not remain *forever?* If, as seems obvious, no limited term of punishment will completely expiate their guilt, that guilt will continue through interminable ages. And, as guilt and desert of punishment are, in the nature of things, inseparably connected, they will *deserve* to be, and may, therefore, *justly* be, punished through the whole period of their existence. In this connexion, it also deserves to be considered, whether those, who die impenitent, will not continue to sin throughout eternity. If, as we have reason to believe, all their exercises and actions will be one uninterrupted series of sins against God, then, they will, on this account, deserve to be punished forever. And God may justly continue to punish them forever for those sins, which they will continue to commit throughout eternity.

It is, again, said, that the *goodness* of God will not permit him to inflict an endless punishment upon any of mankind.

Could we have judged beforehand what plan the goodness of God would lead him to adopt and pursue, we certainly should have concluded, that, instead of ever suffering either moral or natural evil to enter his dominions, he would cause holiness and happiness uninterruptedly to prevail throughout the universe. In a far different manner, however, has he actually ordered events. In the world, which we inhabit, moral evil, and its concomitant natural evils, as pain, sickness, sorrow and death, have reigned from the beginning. All these things have occurred under the government of God. That they *should* occur, is, therefore, consistent with his goodness. But if it is consistent with his goodness to bring the evils, that have been enumerated, upon his creatures in the present world, then, for any thing we know to the contrary, it may be equally consistent with his goodness to bring greater evils upon the wicked in the world to come. As long as it will remain true, that none, by searching, can find out God, or know the Almighty unto perfection, so long will it remain impossible for any man to prove, that the idea of endless punishment is irreconcilable with the divine goodness.

Again it is said, "Christ tasted death for every man; and, therefore, all mankind will be saved."

That Christ died for all, is a doctrine of Scripture. But from this fact it does not necessarily follow, that all men will be saved. Were the atonement of Christ, as some have supposed, a literal purchase, or the literal payment of a debt for the sinner, it would, indeed, be correct to infer from its universality the salvation of all mankind. But the atonement is not to be regarded as the literal payment of a debt. All, that it

has done, is, to render it consistent for God to pardon sin. It was made primarily on *God's* account, that he "might be just and the justifier of the believer in Jesus." It does not remove the ill desert of sinners, but leaves them as guilty and as deserving of punishment, as they would have been, had it not been made. Hence, God is under no obligation, simply on account of the atonement, to save a single sinner from merited punishment. The question, whether all, or but a part of mankind will be finally saved, entirely depends on other considerations than that of the universality of the atonement. Notwithstanding its universality, none will be savingly benefitted by it but believers in Jesus. Instead of saving unbelievers, it will serve to aggravate their future condemnation and misery. Having neglected so great salvation, they will be unable to escape. Having accounted the blood of the everlasting covenant an unholy thing, they will be thought worthy of a punishment peculiarly great in degree.

The opinion has often been advanced, that the future punishment of the wicked will be merely disciplinary,—designed to bring them to repentance and qualify them for heaven. But, on what is this opinion founded? Certainly, not on the testimony of Scripture. The fallen angels have been suffering in hell perhaps for six thousand years. But their sufferings have not *yet* had upon them the effect of a salutary discipline. From our being so frequently warned by Christ and his Apostles to beware of their seductions, we learn, that they are false and seductive still. But if a term of suffering of six thousand years continuance has not brought them to repentance, there is no reason to think, that, how long-soever their term of suffering may be protracted, this effect will thereby be produced. As it respcts the idea, that some of mankind will, after death, be brought to repentance and qualified for heaven, it seems wholly repugnant to the word of God. According to its declarations, as the character of man is at death, so it will continue to be forever. He, who is then righteous, will be righteous still. He, who is then holy, will be holy still. He, who is then unjust, will be unjust still. And he, who is then filthy, will be filthy still. Let not the reader, then, trust his eternal all upon the doctrine of universal salvation. Launch not into the untried and boundless ocean of eternity in so frail a bark, as this. Spend not your precious moments in making covenants with death, and agreements with hell. Your covenants with death will be eventually disannulled,—your agreements with hell will not stand,—and all your refuges of lies will be swept forever away. Flee to Christ. Take shelter in him, as the only ark of safety. Then will you be secure, when the heavens are passing away with a great noise—the elements are melting with fervent heat —the earth is consuming—and Jesus is himself descending "to execute judgment upon all."

F.

For the Christian Magazine.

ANSWER TO MORE INQUIRIES RESPECTING SUBMISSION.

Messrs. Editors,

In my answer to the first Inquiries of Juvenis, upon the subject of submission, I meant to meet

them fairly, and, if possible, to make a reply that would be satisfactory. I have long since believed the sentiment to which Juvenis objects, and considered it capable of being set in a clear and satisfactory light. But I know too well the difficulties of altering the minds of men whose opinions are fixed, to be surprised that I have failed to produce conviction in the present case.

Juvenis thinks that I have misled, or taken a course calculated to mislead your readers, in regard to the real sentiments of Senex, by using the phrase "doubting Christians," instead of "those that have no hope." But if he will again attentively peruse the communication of Senex, he will there find, the phrase "doubting Christian," used precisely in the same sense in which I have used it. The following is an example. "I now ask whether unreserved submission to the divine disposal, is not directly calculated to remove the doubts of a *doubting Christian*, and whether any thing else can do it."

Juvenis thinks he might justly complain of me for saying that he, "by the form and manner of his first inquiries, had raised a great dust." It is not a little strange, that he should think of making this complaint, while he proceeds immediately to charge me with "appealing to popular prejudice, to break their effect;" and follows this with more than an insinuation that I had "ingeniously and slily *dodged* by the point" in question. It seems that he intended to give me at least as much ground to complain of him, as he had of me.

He says, "I regret to find that the point of some of my first inquiries has been *mistaken* in the answer." This is well said, and appears candid, and kind. But there is a difficulty in reconciling it with the charge which he afterwards makes against me "of *dodging* by this same point, with great ingenuity and rather *slyly*." I must certainly be a wonderful man "to *dodge*" "*ingeniously*" and "*slyly* by" a point which I did not see. But the fact is, I neither mistook the point of his inquiries, nor did I dodge by it. I saw it as clearly in his first communication as in his second, and I intended to meet it fairly, and I am now unable to see why I did not. In regard to the assertion of Senex, that "a Christian might be ignorant of his good estate, and consequently suppose that the glory of God might require his destruction," Juvenis inquired whether this ignorance is necessary? "The *point* of my inquiries," says he in his last communication, "was, whether the ignorance of a good man that he is a subject of saving grace, is of this kind necessary, and therefore the basis of an exercise essential to salvation, against which no objection could lie." It was with this *point* of his inquiries full in view, that I gave the following reply. "Whether this ignorance be *necessary* or not, is of no more consequence, as it respects the duty of unconditional submission, than the question whether it is *required* or not. If the penalty of the divine law is just, and an individual sincerely believes, as many a Christian has done, that the glory of God, and the good of his kingdom, require that this should be executed upon him; he certainly must submit to it, or oppose the supposed purpose of God. The fact that this mistake, or ignorance, is not necessary, does not prove that the consequent submission is not necessary,

any more than the fact, that a sinner's wickedness is not necessary, proves that the consequent duty of repentance is not necessary to salvation. It is believed that Juvenis himself will not deny, that a disposition to submit to the known, or supposed purpose of God, is a duty essential to salvation." Now whether the point of this inquiry was either mistaken, or evaded, your readers will judge.

But on this subject, Juvenis inquires, "What is the first duty of a man who is ignorant? Is it not to obtain light?" That is, as I understand him, what is the first duty of a Christian, who is ignorant that he is a Christian? Is it not to obtain evidence that he is a Christian? Very well, admit, if you please, that this is his first duty. How is he to obtain this evidence? Is it not by exercising those holy affections which God requires? Is there any other way in which a person can acquire a knowledge of his good estate? and is not submission to God one of those affections? Unconditional submission is not only a means, by which a doubting Christian *may* obtain evidence of his piety; but it is the means by which many a one has emerged from great and distressing darkness, into the light and liberty of the children of God. And there is no exercise of the mind which can give an individual good ground to hope, while he is conscious of an unwillingness, that God should do his pleasure with him, and every other creature.

After quoting the following questions from my answer to his inquiries, "Can a person be reconciled to God without being reconciled to his *law?* And can a person be reconciled to the law of God without cordially approving of its *penalty?*" Juvenis replies, "To this I would say with all my heart *by no means.* But I would inquire, are we bound to be any more willing to accept the punishment of our iniquity, than God is to inflict it? And how far is God willing to inflict it? On any but the finally impenitent?" Now I will not charge Juvenis, with "*dodging slyly*" by the point of my inquiries; but I cannot forbear to let your readers know *how* he has gotten by it. It is by leaving out the question that contained the *point* of them all, and answering only those which preceded it. The passage which contained these inquiries stands thus in my communication. "Can a person, I ask, be reconciled to God without being reconciled to his *law?* And can a person be reconciled to the law of God, without cordially approving of its *penalty*, as well as precept? *And can a person cordially approve of the penalty of the law, without being willing to* SUFFER *it, provided, in his view, the glory of God requires its execution upon him?*" This last question, with a view to which both the others were asked, and without which they had no perceptible relation to the subject discussed, Juvenis does not see fit to quote, and instead of giving any direct answer to it, proceeds to ask a number of other questions. Now as Juvenis has readily admitted, "that no person can be reconciled to God, without being reconciled to his law; and that no person can be reconciled to the law without cordially approving of its penalty," I should have been much obliged to him, if he had told me explicitly, whether a person can cordially approve of the penalty of the law

without being willing to *suffer* it, provided in his view, the glory of God requires its execution upon him? This certainly is a fair question. Juvenis does not, and cannot deny, that individuals are frequently in such circumstances, as really to believe that the glory of God does require that they should suffer the penalty of his law. The question, therefore, whether in these circumstances they ought to be willing to suffer it, is not only a very plain and simple question, but a truly important one. The proper answer to this question would decide the point in debate. If I can cordially approve of the penalty of the law, without being willing to suffer it, when I verily believe the glory of God requires it should be executed upon me, then I readily admit that the submission advocated by Senex is not essential to true reconciliation to God. But on the other hand, if I cannot cordially approve of his law, without being willing, in the circumstances supposed, to *suffer* it, all that Senex contends for must be admitted. I regret exceedingly that Juvenis did not favor me with an explicit answer to this question. If he had answered it in the negative, it would have rendered all further discussion unnecessary. If he had answered it in the affirmative, it would have left me only the labour of showing that a cordial approbation of the penalty of a law, which we are unwilling should, in the circumstances supposed, be inflicted, is an absurdity.

But I shall bestow a moment's attention upon the questions which Juvenis asks in the place in which he ought to have given an explicit answer to mine.—"Are we bound to be any *more* willing to accept the punishment of our iniquity, than God is to inflict it? And how far is God willing to inflict it? On any but the finally impenitent?" To these I reply, we are under obligation to accept the punishment of our iniquity, whenever we *suppose* it to be the will of God to inflict it. It is admitted on all hands, that we deserve to suffer the penalty of the law. Now if it appears to us that the glory of God requires our punishment, we cannot supremely desire the promotion of his glory, without a willingness to suffer it. There is no plainer truth than this: If we desire the promotion of God's glory more than any thing else, we shall cheerfully submit to whatever *appears* to us *necessary* to promote it. It is in vain to say here that we may be mistaken. True, we may be. But mistaken or not, if we are in the exercise of that love to God, which renders us more desirous of glorifying him, than saving ourselves, we *must* be willing to give up our own salvation, whenever it *appears* to be inconsistent with his glory. To suppose, that we ought not to be willing to suffer the penalty of the law, when this appears to be necessary to the promotion of God's glory, is to suppose, that we have a right to be unwilling that he should be glorified.

It is often said, and Juvenis has repeatedly insinuated, that a willingness to be lost is not required. But that love to God which will influence its subjects to desire the promotion of God's glory, above all things else, is required; and there are instances in which individuals have reason to fear that the glory of God requires their destruction. All impenitent sinners have reason to fear this.

They are now impenitent sinners, they have no evidence that they shall not continue impenitent sinners, and they know that the glory of God requires him to destroy all who do continue to sustain this character. They have *reason* then, I say, to *fear* that God intends to destroy them. This object of fear is a proper object of submission. Juvenis seems in each of his communications to reason as though no *unknown* evil could be an object of submission. But here he is greatly mistaken; and on this subject he and others, reason in a manner entirely different from that in which they reason on other subjects. They believe, and say, that those who have reason to *fear* death, ought to be *resigned* to death; and those who have reason to *fear* sickness, losses, disappointments, and trials, ought to be willing to suffer these things. They speak familiarly of persons being willing to die, while they are yet alive, and *know* not but they shall long continue to live; and they speak as familiarly of persons being willing to suffer any other affliction which they have reason to fear will, in the course of Providence, be brought upon them, without ever thinking that this language is improper, because they do not certainly *know* that it is the will of God, that they should suffer these things. In all ordinary cases, evil in prospect, which is properly an object of *fear*, is deemed a proper object of submission. Why then should not future and eternal punishment, if it be an evil which is deserved, and which God does actually inflict, be an object of submission to all who have reason to *fear* this? But Juvenis gets rid of all this by saying, that "this submission, this willingness to be destroyed in a future state, must be the act either of an impenitent sinner, or of a Christian. If it is the act of an impenitent sinner, it is worth nothing. In such a man, 'there is no good thing.' It must then, if God has required it, and it is essential to salvation, be the act of a new creature, a real Christian. But for a real Christian to be willing that God should destroy *him* in a future state, would imply a willingness that God should violate his promise, 'he that believeth shall be saved.'" Those who wish to see the sophistry of this reasoning satisfactorily exposed, are referred to the communication of Senex, to which Juvenis has undertaken to reply. A word is all that I deem it important to say in relation to it, and that is this: a willingness that God should execute the penalty of the law upon him, if he pleases, is one of those exercises of the mind by which the sinner *becomes* a saint. Juvenis might as well say of the first exercise of love, or the first exercise of repentance, or the first exercise of faith, of which the sinner is the subject, and by which he becomes a saint, that it is an act of an impenitent sinner, and of course worth nothing, as to say this of the submission in question. If it is a truth, that all impenitent sinners have reason to *fear* that the glory of God requires their destruction, they are all under obligation to submit to this, on the same principle that they are all under obligation to be willing that God should be glorified. And every saint, who has not so full an assurance of hope as to preclude the existence of *fear* on this subject is under obligation to exercise the same submission. And let it never be

forgotten, unconditional submission to God on this subject, is one of the best means of gaining evidence of our good estate, and of removing the ground of all fear.

In answer to the common objection that a willingness to suffer the just punishment of our sins in a future state, implies a willingness to remain impenitent, I said, "It is believed that many have been willing 'to accept the punishment of their iniquity,' without once *considering* that it is the purpose of God that all who are cast off shall remain impenitent." "This," says Juvenis, "may be true. But I would inquire, Can God be pleased with an exercise which owes its existence to the want of consideration? Has he suspended our salvation on such an exercise?" But I did not say, nor did I intimate, that this submission owed its *existence* to the want of consideration. This is an inference which Juvenis himself has drawn from my assertion, the absurdity of which he here attempts to charge upon me. This willingness owes its existence to a *regard to the glory of God.* The want of consideration in this case is only a circumstance which frequently attends the exercise of right as well as wrong affections. Does it follow from the fact, that there are unanticipated trials connected with the Christian life which Juvenis has chosen to live, that his entrance upon this course is owing to the want of consideration, and has nothing in it pleasing to God? I am sorry to say, that the kind of sophistry, here exposed, is frequently to be found in the inquiries and remarks of Juvenis. He uniformly represents ignorance as the *ground* of that submission which is contended for by Senex; whereas this is only a circumstance which may call for its exercise, grounded, as it always is, upon a supreme regard to the glory of God. It is amusing to see how Juvenis, while he seems to smile at the idea of any thing being a duty incumbent upon us in consequence of our ignorance, which would not be a duty if we were rightly informed, admits this principle fully in his reasoning against it. He does this when he says, "it is the first duty of a man who is ignorant to obtain light." Here the duty which he inculcates is as much founded on ignorance, as that which he seems to discard for the same reason.

I admitted also, "that those who exercise the submission in question, do sometimes consider that all who are cast off will remain impenitent." The substance of all I said on this subject is what follows. "But allowing, as we must, that they do sometimes consider that all who are cast off, will remain impenitent, the difficulty presented is precisely the same in kind, with that which attends a willingness to remain imperfect, in this life. They can submit to this as the effect of a divine *purpose*, in the same manner in which they submit to any other evil which in itself they hate. Their submission to this, as the effect of a divine purpose, implies no approbation of it as *sin*, nor a disposition to disobey any divine precept; but is perfectly consistent with the most fervent desire to be holy, and with present efforts to continue so. If future impenitence could be viewed in no other light than as the mere criminal act of the sinner, that is, if the purpose of God could not be seen in it, it is readily granted, that it could not

be an object of submission, and that a willingness to be impenitent, in this sense, would be impenitence itself. But to submit to it as the effect of a divine purpose, is the same thing as to be willing in any other case that the counsel of God should stand." With respect to this, Juvenis says, "I beg leave to inquire, how any man that now lives, or ever will live, is to obtain this *view* of his own future impenitence as the effect of a divine purpose? How can he know that there is a purpose of God to this effect? Is it not manifestly impossible for him to know this without a special revelation? *And what right has he to suppose it?* If this *view* is impossible, in the case of every individual, how can any man be accused of any want of 'a disposition to submit to the purposes of God,' by being totally unreconciled to impenitence, either present, or future?"

Answer. The future impenitence of all who shall be cast off, is what *Juvenis* has supposed, and what he and others have repeatedly brought as an objection against the doctrine of unconditional submission. Now if it is a fact, that this is something which "no man has a *right* to suppose in his own case," it certainly cannot be any solid ground of objection to his willingness "to accept the punishment of his iniquity."

The reasoning of Juvenis on this subject is truly singular. It is substantially this. He in the first place, objects to a person's being willing "to accept the punishment of his iniquity," because it is the known purpose of God that all who are cast off shall remain in impenitence, and no man ought to submit to future impenitence. But when the ground of this objection is removed by showing that even future impenitence may be an object of submission, when viewed as the effect of a divine *purpose*, he changes his ground and says, "no man that now lives, or ever will live, can obtain this *view* of his own future impenitence, as the effect of a divine purpose."—"He cannot *know* that there is a purpose of God to this effect,"—and "He has no right to *suppose* it." This is a very good illustration of a common saying: "Error is fated to run crooked."

Senex admitted, and I made the same concession, "that present submission is inconsistent with present disobedience." On this, says Juvenis, I would inquire, "Whether present impenitence is not as much the effect of a divine purpose as future? And if submission to God is inconsistent with present impenitence, why not to that which is future?"

The reason why present submission is inconsistent with present impenitence is, It is impossible that a person should be both penitent and impenitent at the same time. But it is not impossible for him to be penitent to-day, and impenitent to-morrow. To suppose a person submissive to the purpose of God respecting his present impenitence, is to suppose him to be obedient at the very time he is disobedient. But to suppose him now submissive to the purpose of God that he shall in future be impenitent, involves no such absurdity.

Juvenis further inquires, "Is there not an essential difference between God's decrees and their effects?—Because I am found to have a disposition to submit to the former, am I, therefore, to the latter? If I submit to the decrees of God, *as decrees*,—that is, as being what they are, holy,

benevolent, and wise, is not this enough?—Even considered as the effect of a divine purpose, is it not our duty to feel unreconciled to sin?" True, there is a difference between God's decrees and their effects. But it by no means follows from this circumstance, that we may submit to the former, and not to the latter. What does Juvenis mean, when he speaks of submitting to the decrees of God, *as decrees*, and, at the same time, refuses to submit to their effects? Is there, in fact, any such submission as this? *Can* there be any such submission as this? Submission to the decrees of God, if it means any thing, must mean a willingness that what he has decreed should take place. Let us suppose, now, that God has decreed to raise up a wicked prince, and to send him in the pride and stoutness of his heart to chastise America, as he once did the haughty king of Assyria, to scourge his people the Jews. Juvenis, if I understand him, could submit to this decree, "as a *decree*, that is, as being what it is, holy, benevolent, and wise." But he could not be willing that it should go into operation, because this would be submitting to its effects. He could not submit to have his country chastised by this wicked man, "who is God's sword," because this would be submitting to sin. "To sin, even considered as the *effect of a divine purpose*, it is our duty to be unreconciled." Now I ask, to what does this submission amount? If he is not willing that this prince should in the pride and stoutness of his heart, or in other words, with wicked motives, chastise this people, he does not submit to the decree of God, "as being what it is," because by the supposition, it is the decree of God, that he should *thus* chastise us. If there is, as Juvenis contends, such a thing as submitting to God's decrees, without submitting to their effects, then I see not why a person may not submit to the decree of God that he should be sick, without ever being *willing* to be sick, and to his decree that his friends should be taken from him, without ever being *willing* that they should be taken from him, or to the decree of God that he should die, without ever for a moment feeling *willing* to die. How, I ask, do mankind *manifest* their submission to God? Is it not by submitting to the *effects* of his decrees? Does Juvenis consider it "enough" for a man to tell him that he submits "to God's decrees, as *decrees*," while he appears to be totally unreconciled to all their known effects? If Juvenis cannot defend himself against the theory which he opposes, without maintaining the distinction which he has made between submitting to the decrees of God, and their effects, he may rest assured, that he is engaged in a hopeless cause. There is not a plainer truth relating to submission, or to any other Christian duty, than that submission to the decrees of God, "as being what they are," implies a willingness that what is decreed should actually take place. I readily admit, and I have in every part of this discussion admitted, that sin, in itself considered, or viewed only as the criminal act of the sinner, is not an object of submission. But when viewed as the effect of a divine purpose, and as destined to be the means of ultimate good, although an abominable thing in itself, it is as really an object of submission as any other evil.

Again Juvenis inquires,

"Does the purpose of God in regard to sin constitute any thing more than the *moral* certainty of its existence? Is it not a certainty of the same kind, as that which we feel, when we know that a habitual drunkard will become intoxicated, if a sufficient quantity of spirit is thrown in his way?"

To this I reply, that the purpose of God in regard to sin, constitutes an *absolute* certainty of its existence. It is *not* a *moral* certainty, such as we feel, when we know that a habitual drunkard will become intoxicated, if a sufficient quantity of spirit is thrown in his way; for this kind of certainty is nothing more than a very strong probability. Liquor may be placed before an habitual drunkard, and yet not be taken. But there is nothing in the universe more certain, than that every purpose of God shall be accomplished. Not only the agency of creatures, but his own agency is exerted for the accomplishment of all his purposes.

Near the close of my answer to the first inquiries of Juvenis, I said, "It is not, I apprehend, sufficiently considered, that submission always implies an *evil*, real or supposed, to be submitted to;" and added, "this thought pursued, will throw much light upon the subject." After quoting this passage, he says, "This thought I cannot pursue, I am stumbled at the threshold, I know that we are 'to submit ourselves to God.' But, with reverence would inquire, Is God an evil? Is his purpose an evil? Is his sovereignty? Is his law? Is any thing an evil that is in God? or any thing he has ever done? When my heart submits to the justice of God in destroying all the impenitent in a future state, must I say to God, I feel that this thy justice is an evil, but I submit to it: or, is it my duty, and my privilege, to feel that I submit to that which is holy, and righteous, and lovely—essential to the happiness of the universe, and the glory of its author?"

Had Juvenis taken a little more pains to understand me, he might have saved the strength he has exhausted in this formidable array of interrogations. It is a pity that he should work himself out of breath, in beating the air. True, God is not an evil. But this by no means proves that his creatures must not submit to evil, in order to submit to him. It is because he is not evil, but good, that his creatures are bound to submit to the evils which he inflicts. It is true that his sovereignty, his law, his justice and all that is in God, is good. But Juvenis himself will not deny, that in the exercise of his sovereignty, in the execution of his law, and in the displays of his justice, he subjects his creatures to various kinds and degrees of suffering, which in itself is an evil. If he will have it, that this suffering is no *evil*, because "it is essential to the happiness of the universe, and the glory of its author," my reply is, there is then *no* evil in existence, for undoubtedly there is a sense in which every thing that takes place is "essential to the happiness of the universe, and the glory of its author." But to say there is no evil in existence, or that there is no evil attending the displays of God's sovereignty and justice, is to use terms contrary to the universal law of language, and to offer an insult to the common sense of mankind. I shall not here attempt to prove my

assertion, that submission always implies an *evil*, real or supposed, to be submitted to. My limits will not admit of this. But I shall take the liberty to request all who doubt this position, to consider whether they are ever conscious of *submitting* to that which implies no real or supposed evil? or to that which requires no self-denial. We speak familiarly of submitting to sickness, when desirous of health, and of submitting to death when desirous of life. But who was ever heard to speak of submitting to health when he was desirous of enjoying it, or of submitting to life when he wished to live? Now if it is a fact, as I presume all my readers except Juvenis will admit, that submission always respects an *evil*, real or supposed; it will not follow, as he contends, that sin cannot be an object of submission, because it is something which we do and ought to hate.

I regret that Juvenis, after having placed himself in an attitude of an inquirer, and solicited an answer to his numerous questions, should seem to grow impatient with his subject, and conclude his inquiries with a question which has the appearance of a design to reproach the opinion of his opponents. The proposal of this last question, in the terms in which he has expressed it, is in my view, a violation of decorum in religious controversy, which would justify me in passing it without notice. But I shall simply observe, that there is no more effectual antidote against every species of Antinomianism, than that disinterested affection which influences its subjects to submit cheerfully to every known or supposed purpose of God. On the other hand, that selfishness which loves God only for his favors, and which submits to him only upon condition of its own salvation, is, and ever has been, the very essence of Antinomianism.

ALIUS JUVENIS.

THE PILGRIM'S PROGRESS IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.—BY BUNYANUS.

CHAPTER XVIII.

Love-self. I do not like Brother Thoughtful's notions respecting charity at all; and I am persuaded very few pilgrims do. They are too bigoted for this enlightened and liberal age.

No-law. I dislike them for another reason too. If I understand his scheme, he would have it, that we are still under obligation to keep the moral law, and bound to love God with all our hearts, and our neighbor as ourselves; just as Adam was before he fell.

Thoughtful. Certainly. The command is, "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." I suppose we are bound to keep this command.

No-law. Not at all. Such commands are only given to teach us our impotence, and lead us to appropriate to ourselves by faith the finished righteousness of the Prince Immanuel. His obedience was perfect; and when it becomes ours by faith, we are perfect as our Father in heaven. In ourselves we are nothing but sin; but in him we are nothing but righteousness. He "has taken all our sins, and given us all his righteousness."

Thoughtful. If your scheme is true, I see no need of a believer's exercising repentance for any act of sin into which he may fall.

No-l. No. One of my favorite

authors says: "It would be a dishonor done to Christ, tarnishing the glory of *his finished work*, if a believer were ever to be sorry for his sin, or to bow down his head like a bulrush after the commission of it."

Th. Do you think the commission of sin can interrupt the believer's peace of mind, or his communion with God?

No-l. No. The same author says, "Sin can never disqualify him for any one mercy or blessing which God has promised him in his son Jesus Christ, nor can ever for one moment break his peace with God, which is his from eternity through the everlasting mediation of Christ; his, whatever sin he may commit, even robbery and murder." "Sin can do the children of God no harm, holiness no good."

Th. Your language shocks me. I did not expect any one would talk so, who professed any attachment to the blessed Redeemer.

No-l. You do not understand my scheme. It is more honorable to him than yours, or any other scheme of which good works are a part. I exalt his grace; but you depreciate it, by mixing your good works.

Th. I should rather think it would be dishonoring him in the highest degree to call myself a disciple of his, and yet live in the open and allowed violation of his commandments.

No-l. You not only depreciate the grace of God, but his justice too. For it would be as unjust to exact obedience of believers after their surety had rendered it for them, as to exact punishment of them after their surety had suffered that for them. One of my favorite authors says, "While the Mediator was in the world, he rendered a perfect active obedience to the moral law, as the expanded covenant of works, in the room and stead of all those persons whom the Father gave him to be redeemed; and this righteousness is reckoned to all believers for their justification and adoption by the Father, as the legal, perfect, and meritorious cause of the same." He says also, "The Father justifies every one of the elect in the moment in which he is so united to Christ as to believe in him, in consequence of the perfect vicarious righteousness of Christ, which is imputed to the believer, because by the mystical union it has actually become his righteousness, according to covenant." Also, "None can be pronounced by the judicial sentence of God to be just, but those that are perfectly just; and righteousness can be reckoned or imputed to none but to those that possess it." He also says, "while the Mediator was in our world, he endured in his sufferings even unto death, the penalty of the violated law, in the place of all who were given to him by the Father to be redeemed; so that all the sins of believers, past, present, and to come, were legally punished in him, to the full satisfaction of divine justice." Another favorite author asks, "Can they, for whom this satisfaction has been made, be punished for the same sins, for which justice is declared to be satisfied? How can the same crimes be punished twice over in a just government?" And another affirms, "The justice of God renders their salvation absolutely certain; because it would be incompatible with the first principles of equity to punish in their own persons those for whose sins Christ has made ample satisfaction." In view of what these

learned Doctors say, I infer, that neither sufferings nor obedience can be justly exacted of us believers, both having been rendered for us, to the full satisfaction of justice, by our great Surety.

Th. It seems to me that this whole scheme is contrary to scripture, reason, and common sense; and destructive of all true piety and morality. Religion consists in conformity to God, in heart and in life.

No-l. No. Religion consists in faith. You talk like a legalist, and you oppose salvation by grace, as I told you once before.

Th. I consider your faith as no better than your works. It consists in believing that "Christ has taken all your sins, and given you all his righteousness," which is not true with respect to any; and if it were, you have no evidence that it is with respect to yourself.

No-l. Not true with respect to any! Do you think those learned Doctors, to whom I have referred, have taught what is not true? You must not accuse such great men of teaching unsound doctrine.

Th. They may have believed what they taught; but if they did, that does not make it true. I learn from the divine oracles to call no man master on earth; but to try every thing by "the law and the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."

No-l. I will cite another learned Doctor, in confirmation of what I have said already. He observes, "Our sins so became Christ's, that he stood the sinner in our stead, and we discharged. It is the iniquity itself that the Lord laid upon Christ; I mean, it is the fault of the transgression itself. To speak more plainly; hast thou been an idolater, a blasphemer, a murderer, a thief, a liar, or a drunkard? If thou hast part in the Lord, all these transgressions of thine become actually the transgressions of Christ. Nor are we so completely sinful, but Christ being made sin was as completely sinful as we." What do you say to this?

Th. I say I abhor such language, and that whole scheme which justifies it.

No-l. Take heed, then, lest seeking to be justified by the law, you prove that you have no interest in the Redeemer, and fall under the curse.

Th. I thank you for your admonition. I am sensible that I need to take heed lest I be deceived by myself or others. But it is your system, and not mine, which makes justification to be by the law.

No-l. How does that appear?

Th. You hold that Christ both obeyed the law for us, and *suffered* its penalty for us, and so satisfied all its demands upon us; and if so I conclude the law itself must grant our discharge. And agreeably to this, one of the authors you cited, says, "This righteousness [of Christ] is reckoned to all believers for their justification, as the *legal* cause of the same." He also says, "None can be pronounced by the judicial sentence of God to be just, but those that are perfectly just."—And he says this of believers, to show how they are justified. His plain meaning is, that believers are, in the act of justification, pronounced perfectly just; and he thinks they are so. But those who are perfectly just, are justified by the law. When a perfectly just man is brought to trial, the law justifies him, and sets

him at liberty. And when a man who has committed a crime has paid the fine which the law imposes, or has been imprisoned as long as the law requires, and is then discharged, his discharge is by the law, and not by grace or pardon. He would be treated unjustly if he were detained longer. He claims his discharge as a matter of right; he does not ask it as a favor. And accordingly, another of your same favorite authors speaks of its being right to "challenge an acquittance at the hand of God," and says, "He, who as the Judge of heaven and earth must always do right, is said to justify the ungodly—and that out of justice." Again, "God, as he is a just God, cannot condemn the believer, since Christ has satisfied for his sins." Now, it is plain, that if God cannot justly condemn, if he cannot justly punish, then he only does bare justice when he discharges; he exercises no grace in the matter.

No-l. But there was grace in providing a Surety to make satisfaction for us.

Th. Yes. And it is a part of my system, as well as of yours, that the gift of a Saviour was an act of grace. But while that is all the grace your system acknowledges, mine makes every step of our salvation an act of grace. It was an act of grace to provide a Saviour; it is an act of grace to grant us a season of probation; it is an act of grace to change our hearts; it is an act of grace to pardon our sins; it is an act of grace to bear with us from day to day while committing new sins; and it will be an act of grace to receive us to heaven, where we shall be monuments of grace forever. But if your system is true, there is no grace but in the gift of a Saviour. For if Christ "has taken all our sins, and given us all his righteousness," we are no longer subjects of grace, any more than the angels in heaven. Your system, therefore, instead of exalting and magnifying the grace of the gospel, takes away a great part of it, and it makes the act of justification to be by the law, a proper *legal* act, and not an act of grace.

No l. How does your system make every step of the sinner's salvation an act of grace? I see not how it can be, but only as each step is a consequence of the gracious gift of a Saviour. And if that would make it an act of grace, my system would do it.

Th. Justice requires that each individual should be treated according to his deserts. Sin deserves punishment; righteousness deserves no punishment. If all our sins are given to Christ, and all his righteousness is given to us, we no longer deserve punishment. Grace is favor to the ill deserving. If all our sins are taken away, we have none left for which we can deserve any punishment; and therefore we cannot be subjects of grace. No favor shown to the angels in heaven can be an act of grace, because they deserve no punishment. It is only where justice requires punishment that grace can be exercised. I take these to be acknowledged principles, are they not?

No-l. I am not inclined to dispute them now. Go on.

Th. My scheme is, that the moral law is the only rule of right, to which all intelligent beings are bound to conform, because it is right; and that this obligation cannot be fulfilled by any one for another, because the requirement is, "*thou* shalt love;" not *thou* or some other in thy room.

Men have broken this law, and exposed themselves to its curse. Every sin deserves the divine disapprobation now, and will forever, since no length of duration can change its nature. The punishment threatened to sinners is a proper token of that disapprobation. The penalty of the law, therefore, is endless punishment. This we all deserve for our sins, and must always deserve, whether it is inflicted or not, since it will always remain true that we have sinned. This punishment must be inflicted, unless some other way can be found out, by which the divine disapprobation of sin can be as fully and as clearly expressed as it would be in the infliction of the punishment, in which case only it will be consistent for that punishment to be dispensed with by forgiveness. Such a way has been found out. God has provided a Saviour for those who deserve to perish forever. This was an act of grace. The Lord Jesus Christ made an atonement for sin by the shedding of his blood on the cross. His active obedience was rendered for himself, and could not in the nature of the thing be rendered for any but himself. He was as much bound to do right, as any other being can be. And it was necessary that he should be perfectly obedient for himself in order to be qualified to make atonement by his blood, for otherwise he could not have been "a lamb without blemish." In suffering death, he did not suffer the penalty of the law, which is eternal punishment; but he suffered enough, considering the dignity of his person, to make as clear an expression of God's feelings towards sin, as would have been made by the infliction of that penalty upon sinners. The demands of the law upon us remain in their full force, not at all weakened, but rather made stronger by the death of Christ, that event having laid us under additional obligations. Its demand of punishment, however, though still perfectly just, can now be consistently remitted, in the case of those who consent unto the law, and perform the conditions of repentance and faith; because the ends to be answered by their punishment are secured in another way. In consequence of the death of Christ, the offer of pardon is freely made to all without discrimination, and is an act of grace, because all deserve to be cast off without any such offer. A period of probation is allowed, in which men have opportunity to consider their ways, and secure the offered mercy, by a compliance with the prescribed conditions. This is an act of grace, because all deserve instant destruction. All, however, with one consent, reject the offer, and would continue to reject it were nothing more done for them. But God sends his Holy Spirit, to make some willing in the day of his power, by changing their hearts. This is an act of grace, because the gift of the Holy Spirit is a favor which none deserve. When they are made willing, and become holy in the temper of their minds, that does not alter the fact that they have sinned before, and therefore does not take away their desert of punishment for their past sins. It is an act of grace, therefore, to exempt them from that punishment, by granting them remission of sins. And as those who are regenerated continue to be guilty of their old sins, though the punishment of them is remitted, and also to commit new sins, from day to day, it is an act of grace to

spare them from day to day, under their increasing ill desert. And as in the great day it will still be true that they have sinned, it will be true then that they deserve punishment, and therefore it will be an act of grace then to acquit them from it in the presence of the assembled universe. And as it will continue to be true forever that they have committed the sins they have, it will continue to be true forever that they deserve to be punished for them; and therefore, while they reign for ever in heaven, they will be everlasting monuments of grace, rich, free, distinguishing, and sovereign grace. And the most eminent saints on earth, on account of the continuance of their ill desert for past sins, and their increasing ill desert for their daily new sins, feel bound, and feel disposed, to humble themselves before God, and lie very low before him, to acknowledge themselves sinners, exceedingly vile, and to ask every favor at his hand as a free gift to the ill deserving. The language of the scripture saints is highly expressive of such feelings; and such are the feelings of all on earth who resemble them.

No-l. You speak of believers becoming *holy*, as if you supposed they were to be holy *in themselves*. Here is the lurking legality of your scheme, which, though you talk so much about grace, leads you to mix your own works with the righteousness of Christ, as though his finished work needed helping out with some additions of ours.

Ardent. Are not believers spoken of in the scriptures as being "partakers of the divine nature," and "partakers of his holiness?" And is it not plainly declared, that "without holiness no man shall see the Lord?"

No-l. Yes. But one of the learned Doctors before referred to, informs us, that in the last mentioned passage, and I should think also in the others, "*holiness* means separation to God, and not any quality, or grace, or habit of mind;" or else it means "the holiness of Christ *imputed* to us, and so made ours in a judical or legal respect." Believers are "chosen in Christ, to be holy *in him*, even *in him*; but not so as to be holy *in themselves*."

Th. If they are not holy in themselves, they are in themselves unholy and impure, and are not prepared for a holy heaven, where no unclean thing shall enter. None but "the pure in heart shall see God." I am aware that the word *holiness* sometimes means separation to God, as when applied to places, buildings, vessels, and the like, under the old dispensation. But this is not its only meaning. The holiness of God is not of this kind. It is an exercise of his heart. And when believers are said to be "partakers of his holiness," it means that they are holy in the same sense, with the same kind of holiness that he is. They have holy exercises of heart. They are of the same temper of mind that he is; so that they have "fellowship with the Father and with the Son." Without such holiness of heart, which is his own exercise, there is no communion, no oneness of feeling between the believer and the Father. Heaven itself would be no heaven to the man who does not feel as God feels. And this is a sufficient reason, if there were no other, why it is true that "without holiness no man shall see the Lord." If

all the holiness in the universe were *imputed* to him, it would do nothing towards qualifying him to enjoy heaven, till the temper of his heart was made to accord with the temper of heaven. If you have not the same mind that was in Christ, if you have not his Spirit abiding in you and renewing you after his moral image, nothing is more certain than that you are none of his. It is absurd to suppose any to be his *disciples* who never do what he commands. But his commands require perfect conformity to the moral law. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and thy neighbor as thyself. Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect. As he which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation." The promises to change the heart are promises to produce a conformity to the moral law. "A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you; and I will *take away* the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh. And I will put my Spirit within you, and *cause you to walk in my statutes*, and ye shall keep my judgments, and *do* them." It is a plain and decisive declaration, "Every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God. He that loveth not, knoweth not God; for God is love." But it is also declared, "He that loveth another hath fulfilled the law; for love is the fulfilling of the law." And it is written, "He that *doeth righteousness* is righteous, even as He is righteous. He that committeh sin is of the devil. If ye know that he is righteous, ye know that every one that *doeth righteousness is born* of Him. Hereby we do know that we know Him, if we keep his commandments. He that saith, I know Him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him."

Review.

For the Christian Magazine.

REVIEW OF TRACTS *published by the American Unitarian Association.*

[Continued from page 189.]

THE *fourth* Tract in the series under consideration is entitled "*Omniscience the attribute of the Father only.*" It is "a reprint of a Sermon, delivered some years since in England, by Rev. Joseph Hutton," and is founded on Mark xiii. 32, "*But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.*" We have examined the Sermon with considerable attention, and give the following as an analysis of its contents: The twelve first pages may be regarded as an *introduction*, in which the author attempts to vindicate himself and his brethren from the charge of degrading the Saviour; insisting, that if they refuse him divine honors, it is not because they do not love him—that, if they are in error, still they are safe—that others, whom they "deem in gross error," are as safe as they—that Unitarians are most sincere in their views of religious truth—and, of course, that they

ought not to be denied the countenance and fellowship of Orthodox believers. On page 13th, Mr. Hutton introduces his text; and, after asserting once and again, in the next three pages, that Christ was ignorant of the day and hour of which he spake, infers that he did not possess the attribute of omniscience, and consequently could not be a divine person. From the 16th page to the 23d, the author considers the Trinitarian interpretation of his text, that *Christ here speaks, not as God, but merely as man*—affirming that the supposition is absurd, and that it has not been acquiesced in by some Trinitarians, particularly by Mr. Wardlaw. Mr. H. next introduces several classes of passages, to prove the limited knowledge of the Saviour; specially those, in which he speaks of his doctrines as not his own—in which he is represented as *praying*, and as being *tempted*—and "which imply the limitation of any other of his attributes." (pp. 23—34.) He then concludes, with renewedly protesting his sincerity, and fervent charity, though not his infallibility; and with exhorting his hearers to search the scriptures for themselves.

From the foregoing analysis it will be seen, that the main subject in dispute between Mr. Hutton and ourselves, may be reduced to a very narrow compass. It may be resolved into this one question, *Was the divine nature so united with human nature in the person of Christ, that he could consistently speak, and be spoken of, both as God, and as man?* If this question is determined in the negative, then we admit that Mr. Hutton's text, and the other passages which he has cited, are full to his purpose, and go to disprove the divinity of the Saviour—disproving, at the same time however, the divine authority of the *Scriptures*, as being wholly irreconcilable, one part with another. But if the question be determined in the affirmative, then clearly the passages, on which he relies, prove nothing to his purpose. If the divine and human natures were so united in the person of Christ, that he could consistently speak, and be spoken of, both as God, and as man; then he might, as man, represent himself to be ignorant of the hour of judgment, and yet, as God, possess "all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." He might, as man, and as the constituted mediator between God and men, receive his instructions from the Father—might offer supplications to the Father— he might "in all points be tempted, like as" other men—his human attributes might all be limited—in a word, all that Mr. H. has alleged might be true—and yet none of it afford the least evidence that Christ was not a divine person. We repeat it, therefore, as fairly involving the whole subject in dispute, *Was the divine nature so united with human nature in the person of Christ, that he could consistently speak, and be spoken of, both as God, and as man?*

This question, it will be seen, is one of mere *fact*, to be determined wholly by the testimony of Scripture. And it is not necessary that those, who answer it in the affirmative, should go into all the *hows* and the *wherefores*, which may be made to grow out of it—that they should be able to explain, or to understand, the *manner*, in which the divine and human natures are united, in the person of their Saviour. Whether creatures such as we, can comprehend this mysterious union or

not, and whether it seem reasonable to us or not, is of very little consequence. God knows, undoubtedly, what the truth is; and the simple point which it concerns us to know is, *What hath God revealed? What is the decision of the Scriptures?*

Let it be observed then, in the first place, that the Scriptures represent the Lord Jesus Christ as possessing a *divine* nature; or as being, in some sense, *God*. We cannot here go into a citation of passages in support of this proposition; nor do we think it necessary, as full proof of it has been exhibited in a former part of this Review.* Suffice it to say, that the same scriptural arguments, which show the divine nature of the Father, may be urged to show the divine nature of the Son. The Father is denominated Lord, and God, and mighty God, and Jehovah; and so is the Son. The Father is represented as eternal, immutable, omniscient, omnipotent, and omnipresent; and so is the Son. The Father is spoken of as the creator, preserver, governor, and final judge of the world; and so is the Son. The Father is exhibited as a proper object of worship, to saints on earth, and angels in heaven; and so is the Son. The Father too asserts his own divinity; and so does the Son. "*I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, which is, which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.*"†

The Scriptures farther represent the Lord Jesus Christ as possessing *human* nature; or as being in some sense, a *man*. We have as much evidence that he was a man, as that any other person mentioned in the Bible was a man. He was born as a man; he grew as a man; he appeared, lived, suffered, and died, as a man. In numerous instances, he is expressly denominated a man—"*the man Christ Jesus.*"

Yet this mysterious and glorious personage, whose very name is "*Wonderful*"—constitutes but *one person*. He is not numerically two, but *one*—"*one Lord Jesus Christ*, by whom are all things, and we by him."

If now we put together these three particulars, each of which is supported by divine testimony; we shall have from them the following proposition: *The Lord Jesus Christ possesses both a divine and human nature, united in one person.* In other words, he is "*God*, manifest in the *flesh*." He is "the *Word*, made *flesh*." Being in one sense a *man*, he really is—what he was once understood as making himself to be—in another sense, *God*. But if this is the fact, then he may, with perfect truth and propriety, speak, and be spoken of, both as *God*, and as *man*. He may be represented as born of a woman—and yet as the Creator and Preserver of worlds; as "crucified through weakness"——and as possessing "all power, in heaven and on earth;" as not knowing the day or the hour of judgment—and as knowing literally *all things*. We repeat here, what we had occasion to say on a previous page,‡ we fully believe all those passages, which represent the Lord Jesus as, in some sense, inferior to the Father. We believe them in their most obvious sense.—They express a sentiment which is dear, and even *essential*, to our faith, as Christians. And we as fully believe another class of passages, which invest this same Jesus with the glories of the Godhead—which represent him as equal to,

* pp. 153, 154. † Rev. i. 8, 11 and xxii. 13. ‡ p. 181.

and one with, the Father Almighty.

As the discourse before us denies the *omniscience* of Christ, it may be proper to adduce the testimony of Scripture to this particular point. It is said of him by one of the Evangelists, that "he *knew all men*, and needed not that any should testify of man, for he *knew what was in man*." "*He knew*, from the beginning, *who they were that believed not*." Say the disciples to him, on a certain occasion, "Now we are *sure*, that thou *knowest all things*." "Lord," says Peter, "*thou knowest all things*, thou *knowest that I love thee*." He knew the thoughts and designs of those with whom he conversed; and he says of himself, "*I am he which searcheth the reins and the heart*."* And we may farther ask, What *less* than omniscience can qualify the Saviour to be the final judge of angels and men? These, and other similar representations of Scripture—which are not so much as noticed in the Sermon before us—are recommended to the future consideration of those, who deny divine attributes and honors to Christ, and assert, from partial views of the subject, that "omniscience is the attribute of the Father only."

The Tract here examined is to us rather a spiritless production, having less pith and substance than some in the series, and not calculated to produce much effect any way. It is written in a diffuse and complimentary strain, and is distinguished chiefly for its insipidity, and for a fulsome and affected display of charity. The author assures us, once and again, that himself and those who agree with him are sincere in their views and pure and holy in their intentions. And "those who differ most widely from him," he believes are as sincere, as good, and as safe, as they. "They may be in error; but what then? They are in charity; and we do not question their final acceptance with the Father." (p. 6.)

The writer of the *next Tract*, "On the Religious Phraseology of the New Testament, and of the present day," begins with complaining of the vagueness and obscurity of our ideas on the subject of religion—attributing the evil, partly to the spiritual nature of religion, partly to indifference, but especially to the words and phrases in which our ideas on this subject are conveyed. He remarks, first, "on the religious phraseology of the New Testament," and secondly, on that "of the present day." Under the first of these divisions, he considers "the appellations given to Christianity, such as *covenant*, *testament*, *kingdom of God*, and *mystery*; the word by which is expressed "the good or benefit, which Christianity was principally designed to communicate," viz. *salvation*; the prescribed "way of obtaining this good or benefit" —by "exertion on our part," while we depend on the proffered aid of heaven; and "the method in which God bestows his favor, commonly designated by the terms *forgiveness*, and *justification*."— Under the second division, he "notices three kinds of phrases—those which describe the *process of becoming religious*; those which describe the *thing itself*; and those which consist of the *titles* that are appropriated to persons considered religious." Each of these two divisions is followed by general remarks.

The ostensible object of this

* John ii. 24, and vi. 64, and xvi. 30, and xxi. 17. Mat. ix. 4. Rev. ii. 23.

publication is an important one. It is to explain the language of the New Testament, and to free religion from the burthen of a technical phraseology, which is regarded by the author as worse than useless. And there are passages in the book itself, to which, could they be separated from the remainder, we should offer no objection. For instance, in the explanation given of the words covenant and testament—of the consistency of divine and human agency in the formation of religious character—and of forgiveness and justification, as meaning the same—the views of the writer are not materially different from our own. There are other parts, however, which we consider exceptionable, and to these our attention will be chiefly directed.

In several instances, the author, instead of explaining the phraseology of Scripture, *obscures* and *confounds* it. "*Salvation*," he says, "is the great benefit offered in the gospel." But what are we to understand by salvation? It "is *purity of heart*—it is *virtue* and *piety*. The salvation offered in the Scriptures is in itself and essentially that *holiness*, which they inculcate." (p. 10.) Salvation then, according to the new theological nomenclature, is the same as holiness. But suppose the terms be used interchangably, the one for the other. "Behold now is the accepted time; behold now is the day of *holiness*. How shall we escape, if we neglect so great *holiness?* Perfecting *salvation* in the fear of God."

If, to avoid the confusion introduced by this strange definition of the word salvation, it be said that, besides holiness, it includes also the happiness resulting from it; we reply that this is not its meaning. Salvation implies previous loss, and is itself *deliverance* from that loss. In a religious sense, it signifies deliverance from sin, and from misery; but not, unless by consequence, the possession of either holiness or happiness.—Angels are both holy and happy; but they are not the subjects of salvation. They have not been saved, for they were never lost.

Speaking upon *faith*, our author inquires, "Is it better than love, or forgiveness? Is it better than obedience? Rather is it not essentially the *same thing?* No attentive reader of the New Testament can doubt that it is." (p. 19.) Faith, then, according to this critic upon Scripture phraseology, is the same as love, forgiveness, and obedience. Consequently, love, forgiveness, and obedience must be the same as faith. And by a further consequence, since things which are equal to the same are equal to one another, love, forgiveness, and obedience, must be of the same import. If the writer means, that these exercises are the same, because they are all branches of religious duty; then we reply, that he has expressed his meaning very loosely: For on this principle, he might say, that holy joy, and holy sorrow, that keeping the Sabbath and speaking the truth, are all the same. But if he means that they are literally the same, so that the terms expressing them may be used, the one for the other; then he confounds the plainest distinctions, and sets up a principle which cannot be carried through a single chapter of the New Testament, without rendering it perfectly unintelligible.

Forgiveness, we are informed by this writer, is "a disposition in God. It is a disposition to deal mercifully with us." (p. 20.) But

according to this definition of forgiveness, who among the sinful creatures of God are not already forgiven? Who are they, towards whom he has no disposition, could it be consistent, to deal mercifully? And besides, what do we mean when we *pray* for forgiveness? Do we pray that God would cherish towards us a merciful disposition? Do we believe he ever cherished, towards any of his creatures, an unmerciful disposition? And still farther, it may be asked; why should the scriptural signification of the term forgiveness, be so totally different from that in common use? The Judge on the bench, while pronouncing the sentence of the law, may cherish towards the criminal a merciful disposition; but this is not forgiving him. And the chief magistrate, in whom is vested the right to pardon, may cherish towards the convict a merciful disposition, even to the moment of his execution; but neither is this forgiving him. It certainly became one, who was complaining of the obscurity of scriptural language, and was writing with a view to open and explain it, not to "darken counsel by words without knowledge," and thus to obscure and confound it the more.

Our author finds fault, in some instances, with "the religious phraseology of the New Testament," not, as we think, because it does not express the sentiment intended, but because this sentiment does not comport with his own views. He complains that the phrases "born again, created anew," &c. have been arrayed in opposition to "the slow process of spiritual renovation," and have given rise to the notion of "an instantaneous change" of heart. (p. 12.) We are aware, indeed, that these phrases have been thus used; and thus, we are satisfied, they ought to be used. For the very reason that our author wishes them to be set aside, we cannot consent to set them aside. The sentiment they express is as welcome to us, as it can be unwelcome to him. "The slow process of spiritual renovation!" How long does it take a person to turn from the exercise of sin, to the exercise of holiness? "The slow process of spiritual renovation"——prolonged for weeks, and months, and perhaps for years! But what is the state of a person, while this "slow process" is going on—neither one thing, nor the other—neither a sinner, nor a saint! And if taken out of time, while in this state, to what world shall he be consigned?

The religious phraseology of the *present day*, we consider of far less consequence than that of the Scriptures. We shall not stickle for the propriety of every word, or combination of words, by which persons have set forth "the process of becoming religious"—or described religion itself—or designated those whom they have regarded as religious. It would not be strange, if illiterate but well meaning persons have spoken improperly on this subject, as they do on most others. Still the objections of our author to many of the expressions on which he remarks, lie not so much, we are persuaded, against the phraseology, as against the sentiment. The words used give the meaning intended; but this meaning is not consistent with his particular views of truth. We cannot discover the impropriety of representing awakened and convicted sinners as "being anxious—being under concern—be-

ing struck under conviction"—or as "seeing the plague of their own hearts;" and when truly converted, as "being brought out of a state" of darkness; or as "meeting with a change of heart." They do indeed "shadow forth a painful process to be passed through" ordinarily by the hardened sinner, "in order to become religious;" and represent the change as instantaneous. But for this very reason, they are the terms of our choice; they express what we mean; and before we can be persuaded to relinquish them as improper, we must be satisfied of the impropriety of the sentiment they are intended to convey.

Nor can we see the impropriety of representing the newly converted as having an "interest in Christ," as "receiving comfort," and as "rejoicing" in hope; or of representing religion by the terms "grace" or "godliness;" or of representing Christians as feeling "a compassion for sinners, a love of the brethren," or a "love of souls." The most of these expressions are decidedly scriptural, and the objections of our author to them are decidedly unscriptural. For instance, feelings of rejoicing, he says, are "least of all proper to the *commencement* of a religious course." (p. 28.) But when the eunuch believed, and had been baptized, did he not go "on his way *rejoicing?*" And when the jailer and his family had been baptized, did he not "*rejoice*, believing in God with all his house?" On the same page in which feelings of *rejoicing* are objected to, as "least of all proper to the commencement of a religious course," the "*serious* and *solemn* affections" are objected to, as "not presenting a very attractive description of true religion." But if our religious affections must be neither "serious and solemn," nor yet joyful; what must they be? What sort of feelings would our Unitarian friends have us to cherish, on the great subject of religion?

Our author complains, that Christians "are called converts, church members, professors, professing christians, the pious," &c. But really we have not sufficient light or acuteness to discover the impropriety of these appellations. If Christians have been truly converted, why may they not be denominated "converts?" If they have, like Timothy, "professed a good profession before many witnesses," and become members of the visible church of Christ; why may they not be called "professors, professing Christians," or "church members?" Or if they truly love, worship, and serve God, are they not "*pious*," and may not this epithet be justly applied *to them*? Why not call Christians, as well as others, by their right names, and speak of them according to their circumstances and characters?

Our author objects, generally, to the words and phrases on which we have remarked, that they "give a character of *indistinctness* to religion;" "shelter *heartlessness* and *hypocrisy*;" and, especially, that they "make religion a *peculiar thing*, and prevent its diffusion through the mass of society." (pp. 30—32.) But we do not ourselves believe that these objections are valid. Doubtless some may use the words under consideration, as they use other words, without attaching to them any very definite meaning. But the fault, in this case, lies not in the words,

but in the *habits* of the individuals concerned. They would use any other form of words that could be substituted, in the same way. And as to the charge of "heartlessness and hypocrisy," it is yet to be proved, that those to whom the words *grace*, and *godliness*, and *piety*, and a *change of heart*, and *love for souls* have become familiar, are less sincerely engaged in religion, than Unitarians. "By their *fruits* ye shall know them." Who then are *doing most*, for the religious instruction of the rising generation; for the establishment of religious institutions among the destitute of our own country; and for the spread of the gospel throughout the world? But the phraseology in question "tends to make religion a *peculiar thing*, and to prevent its diffusion through the mass of society." And what if it does? Is this an objection to it, or the contrary? We know the influence of names, and doubt not but it would be possible, by the adoption of a religious phraseology less distinctive and expressive than that left us in the Bible, to bring religion down so near to nothing, that those who care little or nothing for the subject, might be induced to embrace it. But a diffusion of religion such as this might better be called an *evaporation* of it—as the effect of it must soon be, to banish religion from the earth. Better, far better let the phraseology of the New Testament, and of Christians too, so far as theirs accords with the Bible, remain as it is; and if the pride of men cannot adopt it, they must reject it. If the world cannot be elevated to the standard of religion, let not religion be brought down to the level of a wicked world. Let "the form of *sound words*," which we have heard from Christ and his holy Apostles, be strenuously retained; and if others cannot walk with us on conditions like these, they must be left to walk by themselves.

We close our remarks on this Tract, with presenting to our readers the following passage, which—though we think the sense might have been better expressed in a more scriptural phraseology—we in the main approve.

"How strong are the indirect intimations, which the scriptures give of the fallen and unhappy state of human nature. Every thing which we are taught concerning our duty, our interest, our spiritual welfare, points to our deficiency and danger. Thus the attainment of the true dignity, excellence, and happiness of our being, is called a salvation. It is a rescue,—it is an escape. It is not an early vigor, and a splendid improvement, but it is poverty, and weakness, and redemption that we hear of. It comes not to us with the beauty and joy of innocence, but under the humbler aspect and name of relief. The richest boon of our existence, you thus see, bears an inscription that testifies to our unworthiness. Observe, too, the characteristics and descriptions of this blessing. The commencement of all that is good within us, must needs be called a renovation; its progress is a conflict; its end is a release. The ritual expressions of it too, are baptismal waters, to wash away our sins, and the symbols of suffering and death, that was endured for us.

"There is then an implication pervading the whole scriptures of the most humbling nature. I had rather, says Dr. Paley, in speaking of that branch of the Christian evidence, which he has so acutely traced out in his Hora Paulinæ —I had rather at any time, surprise a coincidence in an oblique allusion, than read it in broad assertions. His meaning is, that it conveys more proof. And it is so with the subject before us. Stronger than all the direct accusations of guilt in the sacred writings, and more humbling and touching to our feelings, is the indirect and universal recognition in them of our unworthiness—the taking this for granted in the whole system of religion, which they mark out, and as it were, the involuntary aspect of distrust and appre-

hension, with which they regard our condition and prospect." pp. 22, 23.

The next Tract in the series is "a Letter on the Principles of the Missionary Enterprize," by Rev. Dr. Tuckerman, late of Chelsea. It is an earnest and animated discussion of the leading principles of Missionary effort; and, though not free from inconsistencies growing out of the religious sentiments of the author, is yet written with general ability, and with a good spirit. The principles to be illustrated, he describes as follows: 1. "A Christian sense of the moral and religious condition of those, who are living under the influences of heathenism, and of false religion," 2. "A deep and strong sense of the reality, and power, and worth of our religion; and of the inestimable blessings which it will not fail to impart to those, who shall cordially receive, and faithfully obey it." And 3. "God designs that man shall be his instrument, for imparting the blessings of Christianity to man."

Under the first of these particulars, which is that to which our remarks will be chiefly directed, Dr. T. urges the spiritual necessities of the heathen, not only from the direct representations of Scripture, and the testimony of Missionaries, but especially from the *untiring efforts* of our Lord and his Apostles, to improve their condition by imparting to them the Gospel. "Must not their condition," he asks, "have been *most deplorable*, to have excited this sympathy, this interest stronger than death, in their recovery?"

The single error of Dr. T., which we think it needful in this place to notice, is his repeated intimation, that the heathen, notwithstanding their idolatry and consequent debasement, still are, or may be, in a *safe state*. "Our Lord uttered no denunciations against the mere offerers of a false worship; nor did his Apostles, great as was their zeal for the conversion of men, pronounce anathemas against them, merely as idolators." "The true view of heathenism is, not that it is a condition, in which, if a man die, he is therefore necessarily under eternal condemnation. Terrible thought; and most dishonorable alike to God and to Christianity!" "Paul saw not, nor did any of the Apostles see, in the heathen world, men who were doomed to endless perdition, only because they were Pagans."—"The *heathens are safe*, as far as that idolatry is concerned, the evil of which they know not." (pp. 14, 18, 36.) These, and other similar declarations, which occur in the first part of the Tract before us, are certainly *fitted* to leave the impression, that the heathen, though on several accounts they may be objects of pity, are yet, if sincere in their idolatrous practices, in a safe condition for eternity. Now this is a sentiment to which we cannot subscribe, and to which we much regret that any currency should have been given, by one who appears to feel so deeply for the heathen, as the writer of this Tract.

We object to this sentiment, because we think it *unscriptural*. Paul represents the end of heathenish worship and practices to be *eternal death*; and those who had been addicted to these practices as having lived without "hope, and without God in the world." (Rom. vi. 21. Eph. ii. 12.) He enumerates "*idolators*" among those, who shall "not in-

herit the kingdom of God." (1. Cor. vi. 9.) He farther assures us, that "as many as have sinned without law, shall *perish without law;*" and that a leading motive of all his exertions in behalf of the heathen was, that he might, if possible, "*save some.*" (Rom. ii. 12. 1 Cor. ix. 22.)

We object farther to the sentiment in question, that it is inconsistent with the testimony of those who have had the best means of becoming acquainted with the moral state of the heathen. Gladly would we believe that the heathen might be saved, were there evidence that any considerable number of them appeared penitent and humble, and possessed a moral fitness for heaven. But it is painful to observe that all the accounts from them contain not only no evidence of this, but evidence the most indubitable to the contrary. After a twenty years' residence in India, Dr. Ward observes, "*I have never seen one man* (in his heathen state) *who appeared to fear God and work righteousness.* On the contrary, the language of the Apostle seems most strikingly applicable to them all: *There is none righteous, no, not one. There is none that understandeth; there is none that seeketh after God.*" Another Missionary observes, "As my acquaintance with the natives enlarges, *I am increasingly convinced that there is scarcely one, who has the least pretension to any religious concern.*"

The sentiment before us, to which some of the expressions of Dr. T. are fitted to give countenance, seems inconsistent with his representations in other parts of his Letter. "What," he asks, "is there that is low, what that is vicious, or what that is wretched, which was not comprehended in ancient, and which is not comprehended in modern, heathenism? There is nothing to be conceived, either of lewdness or of cruelty, which had not the sanctions of the religion of Greece and Rome, and which is not now a part of the idolatrous worship of the world. The vices were not incidental to this worship, but found, in some of its exercises, their very *spirit and life.* Our religion brings idolatry and false religion before us, as the history of all time represents them, as the *prolific mothers of all the vices and crimes, that can debase our nature, and disqualify for heaven.*" (pp. 21, 14.) In connexion with representations such as these, to the truth of which we most heartily subscribe, to what purpose is it for Dr. T. to tell us, that the Apostles did not regard the heathen as in danger of perishing, "only because they were Pagans;" or that "the heathen are safe," so far as the mere fact of their idolatry is concerned?

We object finally to the sentiment under consideration, that it is fitted more perhaps than any other which could be advanced, to damp the ardor of Missionary zeal. It is the heart-stirring thought, that the heathen in general are living and dying in unpardoned sin, and "perishing for lack of vision," which, beyond every other, excites the sympathies, the prayers, and efforts of the friends of Missions. And we hazard nothing in predicting, that Dr. T. will labor in vain to arouse his Unitarian brethren to any great degree of feeling or exertion in the cause of Missions, until he convinces them of this solemn scriptural truth, and presses it home upon their hearts. Considering the

disadvantages of his religious system, we think he has done well, not only in the letter before us, but in his previous "Appeal to Liberal Christians, for the cause of Christianity in India." He has written with much earnestness, and with ability. But what great results have followed, or are likely to follow, as the fruit of his labours? While therefore, we thank him for his past efforts in a glorious cause, we cannot but ask him to look at the subject again. We hope he may re-examine it with a view to ascertain, whether the system of faith, to which he adheres, possesses sufficient inherent warmth, and furnishes sufficiently powerful motives, to lead to great and vigorous Missionary exertions; and whether, in order to inspire men with the ardor of a Brainerd or a Martyn, he must not approximate much nearer than he is at present, to those views of religious truth, which they received, and which they taught.

Obituary Notices.

REV. HENRY H. F. SWEET.

THE Rev. HENRY H. F. SWEET was the only son of Mr. Henry and Mrs. Lucinda Sweet, and was born in Attleborough, Massachusetts, November 1, 1796. In infancy his parents dedicated him to God in baptism, but his friends have no knowledge that he was the subject of religious impressions, till about the age of nineteen, when during a revival of religion in that place, he became, as he hoped, the subject of a saving change of heart, and in the autumn of 1816, he publicly professed his faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, and united with the second Congregational Church in Attleborough, under the pastoral care of the Rev. N. Holman.

Soon after this he became desirous of obtaining a public education, that he might devote himself to the work of the ministry; and sometime in 1817 commenced preparation for college, and entered Brown University at Providence, Rhode Island, in the spring of 1818. In that place he obtained his classical education, and was graduated September, 1822.* He pursued the study of Theology in Medway, Massachusetts, under the direction of the Rev. J. Ide, and was licensed to preach the gospel, by Mendon Association, in the autum of 1823. November 9, 1825, he was ordained pastor of the Church in Palmer, and the last sermon he delivered was at the anniversary of his ordination."

"As a *Man*, Mr. Sweet was possessed of very amiable qualities. He was gentle, unassuming, and kind in his manners, and in his intercourse with others. Though he manifested much decision and firmness in whatever he deemed important in truth and duty, yet he seemed desirous to make others easy and happy around him. With strong social affections, and a cheerful turn of mind, he was formed to give pleasure to his friends, and to find enjoyment in their society. Possessed of an uncommon knowledge of human nature, for one of his years, and capable of turning this knowledge to good account, he was prepared to acquire, and to use in a wise manner, a great influence among those around him. No one, who was not lost to all sense of worth, could become acquainted with him, without esteeming and loving the man. His mind, though not brilliant, was above the ordinary level. It was not content with a superficial knowledge of things. Its conceptions were clear and methodical. Patient of investigation, logical in reasoning, it seemed fully to grasp and thoroughly to understand the subjects to which its powers were applied. It was evident that he had made the

* Mr. Sweet entered the Freshman class half advanced, and was out of College one year teaching school, in order to obtain means to prosecute his studies.

most of his opportunities of education. His mind was well disciplined, and he sustained a very respectable rank as a scholar.

As a *Preacher*, he was very interesting and impressive. His manner would not probably come up to the rules of that modern eloquence, which often pleases and astonishes, but lodges nothing in the mind as a reason for the effect; but it was sober, chaste, becoming the solemn subjects of eternity, judgment and salvation. He presented truth in a clear, lucid, understanding manner. The mind was filled with the subject, not with the preacher, and so that the heart and conscience felt a deep interest. If the sinner was excited, it was with the truth; if the Christion was edified, his thanks were given to the God of truth. His sermons were, therefore, as we should suppose, full of good matter well arranged, and urged by arguments happily chosen to carry conviction to the understanding and the heart. None could listen to them without being satisfied of the truth of what he attempted to prove; and the hearer could not well avoid feeling that the subject was the great thing which claimed his attention. Indeed he seemed, though unconsciously, to make the apostolic standard his own. "We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord, and ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake." At the same time, he had a low opinion of his own performances. They came so far short in his own apprehension, of what they ought to be, that he expressed his wish, near the close of his life, that they might never see the light. To shine, to be admired and applauded, to show himself, to be distinguished among his peers, did not seem to be in his thoughts, nor to enter into his motives of action; but to do good, to be useful, to preach the truth, to instruct and edify God's people, to bring sinners to repentance, to promote the cause of Christ, appeared written on all his labours as a minister.

He was, thoroughly, Calvinistic in his views of truth. The doctrines, which he derived from the Bible, were the doctrines of grace, which are mighty through God, and which he felt to be the grand instrument employed, by the Holy Ghost, to convert sinners and build up the kingdom of Christ. These, with all their practical influence and effects upon the character, comprised the grand theme of his preaching.

As a *Pastor*, he seemed to be well fitted or his station. He was not hasty, but solemn, deliberate, wise, decided in managing all matters which related to the church. His intercouse with his people was calculated to conciliate their feelings, while at the same time it was suited to reclaim the wandering, and bring the backslider and the sinner to consideration and repentance. He favored, and set in operation, all those means, by which the children of the church are instructed, and revivals of religion promoted; and his gifts were well fitted to render the religious meeting profitable and to feed and nourish the lambs of the flock.

As a *Christian*, he indulged the comforting hope, that he had experienced renewing grace and was reconciled to God and justified, through the atonement and righteousness of Christ. He never spoke, with high confidence, of his religious attainments and experience. A deep sense of the evil of sin, of the holiness of God's law, of the remaining wickedness and deceitfulness of his own heart, seemed to make him very distrustful of himself. He appeared, therefore, to be clothed with humility, while, at the same time, he exhibited the cheerfulness of a good hope. While he leaned with confidence on Christ, he feared "lest after having preached to others he himself should be a cast-away." As he approached nearer the grave, Christ, in his whole character, and all the doctrines of salvation by grace appeared more and more precious to him. When he found himself sinking down to the grave, he experienced indeed some struggle with himself. He saw his prospects of usefulness in the church on earth,—of doing good to his friends, who were dependant upon him, and of labouring among the people of his choice and his love, about to be unexpectedly cut off. This, at first, seemed to try his faith and confidence, and to occasion some degree of dejection. But he soon rose above this trial, and was made willing to leave every thing which seemed to render life desirable, to leave his friends and his dear people, in the hands of God, and go, at the call of

his Saviour, through the dark valley of death to join the church triumphant in heaven. Although he had not such a lively and comforting sense of the presence and grace of Christ, as he earnestly wished to enjoy, yet his hope was as an anchor to his soul. The predominating exercise of his heart seemed to be repentance for sin; this, however, was mingled with such love to Christ and faith in his merits, that he was, indeed, all his salvation and all his desire. A short time before his death he partook of the sacrament of the supper with a few brethren. In this service we trust he received Christ afresh for righteousnes and life. If throughout his long and distressing sickness, he did not uniformly have strong consolation, yet peace, calmness, submission, and an earnest desire to glorify God, discovered a soul resting upon the rock of ages and prepared to enter upon the joys of the blessed. Whatever doubts troubled his mind, it was obvious that God was the centre of his affections, that there was none in heaven or on earth that he desired besides him. Thus died one, whose memory will be dear to this people, and who will be embalmed in the recollection of his friends.

Rev. Mr. Ely's Sermon.

Ordinations and Installations.

Installed, at Rochester, Ms. the Rev. JONATHAN BIGELOW, as Pastor of the Central Congregational Church in that town. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Storrs, of Braintree.

April 19,—At a meeting of the Presbytery of Hudson, held at Hopewell, Orange co. N. Y. the Rev. ROBERT ROY was ordained as an Evangelist.

April 20,—In the Parish of Prince George, Winyaw, S. C. by Bishop Bowen, the Rev. PAUL T. KEITH, assistant minister of that parish, was ordained a Priest.

April 25,—Rev. DANIEL S. SOUTHMAYD was ordained Pastor of the Trinitarian Chh. and Society in Concord, Mass. Sermon by Rev. Dr. Murdock, of Theological Seminary, Andover.

April 25,—Rev. WILLARD CHILD was installed Pastor of the Congregational Church in Pittsford, Vt. Sermon by Rev. Dr. Bates.

May 2,—Rev. HENRY B. HOOKER was installed as Pastor of the Congregational Church and Society in Lanesborough, Mass. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Walker, of Rutland, Vt.

May 4,—At an ordination held in St. Michael's Church in Bristol, R. I. by the Rt. Rev. Bp. Griswold, Mr. ROBERT B. DRANE was admitted to the Holy Order of Deacons. At the same place, and by the same, on Sunday, May 6, Mr. HENRY C. KNIGHT was admitted to the Holy Order of Deacons, and the Rev. JOHN BRISTED to the Order of Priests.

May 16,—Ordained at Columbia, (Waterbury) Conn. over the Congregational Church in that place, Rev. J. E. BRAY, late of N. Guilford.

May 19,—Rev. WILLIAM S. PLUMMER was ordained at Danville, Va. as an Evangelist, by the Presbytery of Orange. Sermon by Rev. James W. Douglass.

May 20,—Rev. E. EVANS, from Wales, was ordained as an Evangelist, by the New York Independent Association, in Providence Chapel, Thompson Street, New York. Sermon by Rev. S. Overton, New Jersey.

May 23,—Rev. DAVID PAGE SMITH was ordained over the Congregational Church and Society in Sandwich, N. H. Sermon by Rev. Jacob W. Eastman, of Methuen, Mass.

May 23,—Rev. EBENEZER COLMAN was installed Pastor of the Congregational Chh. in Swanzey, N. H. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Barstow, of Keene.

May 23,—Rev. RALPH S. CRAMPTON was ordained Pastor of the Congregational Church in South Woodstock, Con. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Hotchkiss, of Saybrook.

May 22,—Rev. ELDAD W. GOODMAN was installed as Pastor of the Congregational Church in Springfield, Vt. Sermon by Rev. P. Cook, of Acworth, N. H.

June 5,—Mr. SAMUEL NICHOLS was ordained as an Evangelist, at South Reading, by Andover Association. Sermon by Rev. J. Edwards, of Andover.

June 5,—Rev. JOHN WILDER, jr. was installed Pastor of the Calvinistic Congregational Society in Charlton, Mass. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Vaill, of Brimfield.

June 10,—At Richmond, Vir. the Rev. STEPHEN TAYLOR was installed Pastor of the Presbyterian Church on Shockoe Hill. Sermon by Rev. Wm. J. Armstrong.

THE

CHRISTIAN MAGAZINE.

VOL. IV. AUGUST, 1827. No. 8.

SERMON.

ACTS, XXVI. 9. *I verily thought with myself that I ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth.*

PAUL was by birth a Jew, by tradition a Pharisee, and by conversion a Christian. His conversion from Judaism to Christianity was a very great and sudden change, which excited great admiration. Neither the friends, nor enemies of Christ could easily believe, that the most bitter and powerful enemy of the Gospel, had become its sincere friend and defender. But Paul soon convinced the world, that he had become a warm and zealous friend of that cause, which he had violently opposed and endeavoured to destroy. His zeal in preaching the Gospel and spreading the religion of Christ, awakened the enmity and opposition of his former friends, who took the first opportunity of manifesting their resentment. As soon as he returned from his journey from Damascus, and openly appeared in Jerusalem, the Jews conspired to take away his life, and would have executed their purpose, had not the chief captain rescued him from their hands. This officer committed him to Felix, and Felix committed him to Festus. While he was under the authority of Festus, he presented him to king Agrippa, who wished to hear what he could say in defence of himself and the new religion which he had embraced and propagated. In this defence, he related his views and feelings both before and after his conversion. And speaking of himself before he embraced the Gospel, he said, "I verily thought with myself that I ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth."

To set this passage in clear light, it is necessary to show,

I. That Paul had a wrong opinion of Christ, before he embraced the Gospel;

II. That he acted sincerely in opposing Christ;

III. That he was criminal in opposing Christ;

IV. To point out wherein his criminality consisted.

I. I am to show, that Paul had a wrong opinion of Christ, before his conversion. Paul was a Pharisee, and a great stickler for the peculiar sentiments of his own sect. He agreed with them in their notions of the Mosaic laws, rites, and ceremonies, and of the character of the promised Messiah, and of the predictions

sincere in opposing Christ. He solemnly declared his sincerity before king Agrippa. "I verily thought with myself that I ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth." Every man always thinks he is so far sincere, as he speaks and acts according to his real opinion. And so far as we believe, that any man speaks and acts according to his real opinion, just so far we always believe he is really sincere. If Paul verily thought, that Christ was an impostor, his conscience must have told him, that he ought to speak and act against him, and do all in his power to defeat his design and destroy his cause. This duty was expressly enjoined upon him in the 13th chapter of Deuteronomy. "If there arise among you a prophet, or a dreamer of dreams, and giveth thee a sign or wonder, and the sign or wonder come to pass whereof he spake unto thee, saying, Let us go after other gods, which thou hast not known, and let us serve them; thou shalt not hearken unto the words of that prophet, or that dreamer of dreams: for the Lord your God proveth you, to know whether ye love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul. Ye shall walk after the Lord your God, and fear him, and keep his commandments, and obey his voice, and ye shall serve him, and cleave unto him. And that prophet or dreamer of dreams, *shall be put to death*, because he has spoken to turn you away from the Lord your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt," &c. This divine injunction bound Paul as a Jew to oppose every impostor; and so long as he really thought that Christ was an impostor, his conscience must have dictated, that it was his duty to oppose such a deceiver, and those who suffered themselves to be deceived by him Hence his opposing Christ and his followers is a clear and conclusive evidence of his sincerity. He believed Christ to be an impostor, and he treated him as God required him to treat an impostor, which was the best evidence he could give, that he was really sincere in doing many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth. But yet,

III. He was really criminal for all his opposition to Christ and his followers. Of this he was fully convinced, after his heart was renewed and united to Christ. Though he knew he was forgiven, yet he could never forget his criminality in opposing the divine Redeemer, and persecuting his sincere and inoffensive followers. He never could speak of this part of his conduct without self-condemnation and self-abasement. Referring to this subject he said, "And last of all he was seen of me also, as one born out of due time. For I am the least of all the Apostles, that am not meet to be called an Apostle, *because I persecuted the church of God.* But by the grace of God I am what I am." In another place speaking of himself he says, "Who was before a *blasphemer, and persecutor, and injurious.*" And again he says, "Concerning zeal, *persecuting the church.*" As soon as he was thoroughly convinced, that Christ was the true Messiah and Saviour of the world, and that his religion was truly divine; he was equally convinced, that all his past enmity and opposition to him, and to his friends, and to his cause,

was altogether criminal and inexcusable. His conscience condemned him for all the prejudice, selfishness, and malevolence, which he had felt and acted out, in opposing the Lord Jesus Christ and his kingdom in the world. He felt that his past sincerity did by no means excuse his blaspheming, persecuting, and injurious spirit. And his consciousness of guilt is an infallible evidence of his criminality in all he said and did against the name of Jesus of Nazareth. But if we could even suppose, that *he* was deceived in respect to his guilt, yet we could not suppose that Christ was deceived in respect to it, who knew his heart and expressly charged him with guilt for persecuting himself, when he was going to Damascus with a full purpose of persecuting his disciples. As he met and appeared to him on the way, he solemnly demanded, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" Thus it is too plain to be denied, that Paul was verily guilty, notwithstanding his sincerity, in opposing Christ and his cause. But it still remains to be inquired,

IV. Wherein his criminality consisted.

Many have found a difficulty to reconcile Paul's criminality with his sincerity. If he verily thought that he ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth, they have seemed to imagine, that his sincerity left no room for guilt. And though he acknowledges, that he did wrong in opposing Christ, they cannot easily discover wherein his criminality consisted. But if he was really guilty for doing what he did against Christ, it is to be presumed, that his criminality may be pointed out. Here then it may be observed,

1. That Paul was to be blamed for *forming* his false opinion of Christ. He was acquainted with the Old Testament, which contained not only various types of Christ, but plain predictions of the time, and place, and circumstances of his birth; of his design in coming into the world; of the miraculous works which he should perform; and of the sufferings he should endure, and of the death he should die on the cross. Many of these predictions he had an opportunity of seeing fulfilled. And by comparing these prophecies with his life and death, he might have proved to himself what he afterwards proved to others, that Jesus was the Christ. We are told, that when Ananias came to him, after his conversion, and put his hands upon him, "Immediately there fell from his eyes as it had been scales: and he received sight forthwith, and arose, and was baptized. And straightway he preached Christ in the synagogues, *that he is the Son of God.* But all that heard him were amazed, and said, "Is not this he that destroyed them who called on this name in Jerusalem, and came hither for that intent that he might bring them bound unto Jerusalem? But Saul increased the more in strength, and confounded the Jews which dwelt at Damascus, *proving that this is very Christ.*" All this evidence of Christ's being the Son of God, the promised Messiah, and Saviour of the world, Paul was to blame for not seeing before; for he might have seen it, and would have seen it, if his heart had been free from prejudice, partiality, and selfishness. If he had regarded God more than man, and the Scriptures more than tradition, he would never have thought Christ was

an impostor, but have been fully persuaded that he was the very Christ, the true Immanuel, who came to save his people from their sins. He was, therefore, without excuse for his first error in thinking that Christ was an impostor. While he dwelt at Jerusalem with Gamaliel, he had an opportunity, and it is likely he improved it, of seeing Christ, of hearing him preach, of beholding his miracles, and of attending his crucifixion. These things would have carried conviction, had he not resisted the light, and chosen to deceive himself. His ignorance and errors, under such circumstances, were totally inexcusable. He loved darkness rather than light, and error rather than truth. It was altogether owing to his evil heart of unbelief, that he formed a false and groundless opinion of Christ, notwithstanding that full blaze of light, which was exhibited before him. His self-deception was extremely criminal and inexcusable.

2. Paul was blamable for *persisting* in his wrong opinion of Christ. He had no right to form a false opinion of him at first; for he came at the time predicted, appeared in the circumstances foretold, performed the works assigned him, and finally suffered and died according to the Scriptures. But after all these things, the evidences of his being the Son of God and Saviour of the world continually increased. For God raised him from the dead; he appeared to many after his death, commissioned his Apostles to go into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature; thousands in Jerusalem and other parts of Judea believed the Gospel which they preached and confirmed by miracles. And Paul himself heard Stephen prove from the Old Testament, that Jesus was the Christ, and then saw him seal with his death the truth of the doctrine he had proved. If Paul never had before, he then ought to have given up his false opinion of Christ, and cordially embraced the Gospel. Indeed, there never was a time, after he formed his false opinion of Christ, in which he might not and ought not to have given it up. As he had no right to form a false opinion of Christ, so he had no right to persist in it. Sufficient light was continually shining around him, to convince him of his erroneous opinion. Some errors after they are formed are invincible, because there are no means left to discover them. But Paul's error concerning Christ was not of this kind. It was a voluntary error at first, and his persisting in it was voluntary. On this account, he was totally inexcusable for obstinately persisting in it in opposition to constantly increasing light. All the saints he saw, and especially all he persecuted, called upon him with a piercing and heart-affecting cry, to renounce his error, and believe the saving truths which they believed. They saw, believed, and professed the truth respecting Christ, at the risk of their lives, which was the highest testimony they could give in favour of the divinity of his person and the truth of his doctrines. Besides, there was nothing in the word of God, or divine providence, to counteract or weaken the evidence of Christ's being what he professed to be, the promised Messiah and Saviour of the world. His ignorance of Christ, therefore, was a voluntary ignorance, his error a voluntary error, and his sincerity in error was the fruit of the most

obstinate prejudice and unbelief. So that he was constantly increasing his guilt in verily thinking, and continuing to think, that the blessed Saviour was a vile impostor.

3. Though Paul verily thought that he ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth; yet he was extremely criminal for doing them from *selfish* and *malevolent* motives. It appears from his own account, as well as from the account of others, that he acted under the influence of malice and revenge in opposing Christ and his cause. The first account of him is, that "he consented to the death of Stephen, and kept the clothes of those who stoned him." After this, we are told, "that he made havoc of the church, entering into every house, and haling men and women, committed them to prison." And the next account is, "that Saul, yet breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord, went unto the high priest, and desired of him letters to Damascus to the synagogues, that if he found any of this way, whether they were men or women, he might bring them bound unto Jerusalem." In these instances of his conduct, he manifested a most malignant spirit, which took pleasure in the torture and misery of the sincere and patient followers of Christ. But his own account of himself, while a persecutor, and acting agreeably to his misguided conscience, gives the most striking evidence of his malignant spirit, notwithstanding his professed sincerity. This account we have in the text and the following verses. "I verily thought with myself that I ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth. Which things I also did in Jerusalem; and many of the saints did I shut up in prison, having received authority from the high priest; and when they were put to death, I gave my voice against them. And I punished them oft in every synagogue, and compelled them to blaspheme: and being exceedingly *mad* against them, I persecuted them even unto strange cities." Now, though Paul verily thought that he ought to do all these things; yet he had no right to do them, from such a malevolent spirit. Men may do their duty in acting according to the dictates of a misguided conscience, if they act from truly benevolent motives: but they can never do their duty in acting agreeably to the dictates of even a well informed conscience, from selfish or malevolent motives. Though Paul's error had not been invincible, as it was not, yet this conduct would have been justifiable. But he was altogether criminal in obeying his misguided conscience, from a cruel, malevolent, persecuting spirit. *Conscience*, as well as the *divine law*, must be obeyed from a *pure and pious heart*, or there is no duty done, but sin committed. Men really sin, while they do those things which the divine law requires and conscience dictates, if they act from a selfish, wicked heart. Though Paul acted agreeably to the dictates of his conscience in opposing Christ and his cause, yet he was verily guilty for acting from corrupt and malevolent motives. And had Christ been, as he supposed, a real impostor, and his religion a delusion, still his malignant opposition to both him and his cause would have been absolutely sinful. So that his sincerity did by no means excuse the malignity of his heart.

[To be concluded.]

For the Christian Magazine.

A COLLOQUY ON THE MEANS OF REGENERATION. BY INVESTIGATOR AND SUPERFICIUS.

Investigator. Well, friend, as we have a little leisure, let us, if you please, resume the subject on which we began to converse the other day.

Superficius. You refer to the means of regeneration, I suppose?

Inv. I do, Sir; and the reason of my wishing to resume the subject is, that we may come at the truth, and endeavor to obtain clear and definite views in regard to it. There are few subjects, as it seems to me, on which it is of more importance to have such views; and yet few, on which the views of Christians generally, are more indefinite and divided.

Sup. It is important, no doubt, to understand the subject, but for my part I never had any difficulty about it. I think it plain enough that there are such means, and that of course they are to be used. We have evidence of it from Scripture, reason, and fact.

Inv. Very true; but let us be a little more definite. There are means by which regeneration is effected; that is, by which holiness is begun in the heart, and, also, means by which it is subsequently increased; now, will you have the goodness to specify *by* whom and *for* whom these means are to be used for these purposes.

Sup. Why, by all and for all, to be sure, who have them within their reach;—more especially, however, by ministers of the Gospel.

Inv. I hope you will pardon the obtuseness of my faculties; but I must say, I do not yet definitely understand your meaning. I will be more explicit myself, and reduce my question to simple terms; for, perhaps, I have not made myself understood. As it respects those, in whose hearts holiness *already* exists, it is evident that *they* should use means to *increase* it both in *their own* and in *each other's* hearts; and it is also evident, that *they* should use means to *excite* holiness, in the hearts of those in whom it *does not* exist: that is, that *they* should use means to effect the regeneration of the unregenerate. But *are there any means which the* UNREGENERATE are to use, IN ORDER to excite holiness in their *own* hearts?

Sup. Most certainly. Do you suppose they are to fold their hands and do nothing? That they are to use no means whatever,—not even to attend meeting, read the Bible, and pray?

Inv. Certainly not. You mistake my meaning. I do not intimate that they are not to use means, for I believe it is their duty to do it, as much as it is the duty of Christians. But *how* and for *what* should they use them? Why, with the *same disposition* that Christians do, viz. a right, holy disposition. The Bible no where, as I can find, requires or *allows* any to use them with a *different* disposition; but it seems to require that every moral agent, sinners as well as saints, should use them with a holy disposition; and to intimate that God cannot accept them if used with any other. Hence, if they should use them with the *same disposition*, they should use them for the same *purpose*, that Christians do; and *not in order to the beginning of holiness in their hearts.* For this, as I conceive, would be absurd; because using means

with a right or holy disposition, implies that holiness is *already commenced* in the heart, *as soon as they begin* to use them. Hence, to say that a sinner must use means, *in order to begin to be holy*, is the same as saying in other words, that *with a holy disposition*, he must use means, *in order to the beginning* of a holy disposition. This, then, I suppose, cannot be your meaning in the answer you gave to my question?

Sup. You are always for carrying matters to extremes, and trying to make hair-splitting distinctions. For my part, I was never fond of that method of reasoning. But it is utterly impossible for me to see, according to your theory, how you would ever direct a sinner to begin to be holy, if not by using means?

Inv. I never would direct him *how*, for this would be going farther than the word of God. God requires that the sinner should exercise love to him—that he should repent, pray, &c. but he has no where told them *how* to go to work, if I may so speak, to exercise love, repentance, and a spirit of prayer.

Sup. What, then, is the use of means to the unregenerate?

Inv. God makes use of them in the hands of his children to bring them to repentance, and persuade them to exercise love; but he no where requires or *allows* the unregenerate to use means *with an unregenerate heart*, in order to begin to be holy; for this would imply that he allowed them to remain unregenerate, or at enmity with him, *while using* the means. Whereas he has made it a sinner's *first* and *immediate* duty, to love him, and to repent of his sins.

Sup. Then, impenitent sinners must not pray, or read the Bible, or do any thing, before they love God and repent?

Inv. Certainly, they cannot be justified in doing any thing *while* their hearts are unreconciled to God; nor can ——

Sup. Then they must wait and not try to do any thing till they love God?

Inv. No, brother, why do you ask if they must *wait*, when it is their *immediate* duty to be reconciled to God? Or, if you please, when it is their immediate duty to use the means of salvation, such as prayer, searching the Scriptures, attendance on preaching, &c.

Sup. But you are coming over to my side of the question, it seems, and begin to think they must use the means.

Inv. I have never said any thing against their using the means of salvation, with a right disposition; but have repeatedly said this was their duty. But I have opposed the absurd idea of their using means *with an unholy disposition*, in order to begin to be holy.

Sup. But how *can* they use the means of salvation with a holy disposition, when they have no such disposition?

Inv. I answer this, by asking a similar question, viz. how can they love God, when they have no love to him? The true answer is, they cannot, *while* they have no love to him; but is this a good reason for not loving him? And is the fact that sinners have not a holy disposition, a good reason why they should use means with an unholy one? No; certainly not, God does not think it so; but on the contrary, the very fact that they do not love him, and have not a holy disposition, is a reason why he commands them to love him, and to exercise such a disposition.

Sup. But, after all, a sinner will not use the means, at first, with such a disposition; may he not therefore use them as well as he can?

Inv. The fact that a sinner *will* not rightly use them is certainly no reason why he *ought* not, or why he should be justified or *allowed* in a wrong use of them, or why he should have it intimated to him that he *may* thus use them.—But what do you mean by "*as well as he can?*" Your language must imply that he cannot, that is, *is not disposed* to use them with a right disposition, and *therefore*, in using them, he may *come as near having such a disposition as he is disposed*, and no more! Now I believe you will shrink from such an idea, but it is certainly a correct inference from your language.

Sup. What, then, shall a sinner do? Your instructions would utterly discourage them from the use of means, and drive them to despair.

Inv. Well, brother, ought they not to be discouraged in such a case? Ought they not to despair of ever beginning to be holy, or of recommending themselves to God, and thinking they are in a fair way to be converted soon, by using means with a wicked disposition? Now, to urge a sinner to the use of means, with a humble, broken heart, telling him not to rest satisfied without it, instead of being a discouragement for him to use them, would, as I think, have quite a contrary effect. But, on the other hand, if any one should undertake to ease the matter a little with him, by giving him to understand that he might use them, with a wrong disposition rather than not at all, he would be more likely, by such intimations, to encourage him to delay repentance and to live in sin; than in any other way.

Sup. But do not sinners often use them while unregenerate; and does not fact show, that by doing so, a good effect is often produced? And would not you have more hope that he would become a Christian, who did thus use them, than that he would who neglected to use them at all?

Inv. The fact that sinners often do use them while unregenerate, I admit. Perhaps this is universally the case with them previous to their conversion; and doubtless, it often has a good effect, in one sense of the word,—though I think its effect depends very much on the state of the sinner's mind, who thus uses them. If he is unawakened, and unconvinced of sin, then his constant use of them may have a tendency to make him self-righteous, or to quiet his conscience in sin. But if he is convinced of sin, and deeply distressed on account of it, then, I think such attempts as he makes at prayer and other duties, has this effect, viz. to convince him more deeply of sin, of his lost and helpless condition, and his indispensable need of divine assistance. And I admit that in such a case, at least, I should have more hope of his becoming a Christian, than of one, who in a thoughtless state, made no use of means, at all. But I must add; though the use of means with an unregenerate heart, often actually produces such an effect on the mind of an awakened sinner, as I now speak of, yet I never would urge him to such a use of them, or intimate that he might so use them, for several reasons. 1. Because God has never done it; but on the

contrary has said such a use was not acceptable to him. 2. Because he has never given any warrant for any one to do it, but has said the *first* and *immediate* duty of every sinner is to repent of sin and exercise love to him. 3. Because there is no need of thus directing him. If his sinful state is set before him, and he is made to feel that repentance and love to God, are his undeniable, unavoidable, and immediate duty, there is no danger but he will make unregenerate attempts enough, at using means,—even more than he would if encouraged to make them. But 4. To tell, or even intimate to him that he is more likely to become regenerate, by such a use of means, than as though he wholly neglected them, or was careless and indifferent, would be hazardous in the extreme. For, in the first place, though it is more *likely*, yet it is not any more *certain* that he will, than as though he was indifferent and wholly neglected them. In the second place, he would be liable, from such intimations, to rest in such a use of means,—to take courage and hope in them, while he was unreconciled to God; and thus lose his fears and convictions and perhaps his soul. Besides, thirdly, I can conceive of no possible good that would result from thus directing him.

Sup. But would it not encourage him to keep using them, till he became holy?

Inv. It would indeed encourage him to keep using them for a while at least, but not till he had obtained grace, for no sinner ever did or ever will obtain grace, while continuing in such a use of them. What! because he is unwilling to use them, at present, with a humble, penitent heart, shall he be told, that he may continue to use them with an unhumbled, impenitent heart? And with the hope, too, that God will sooner or later, accept of and bestow grace in answer to them? Or that he will be more likely to accept of them than none at all? Besides, such directions would give him to understand, that it will be *easier* to use them with a right disposition, after a while, than now—or than it will to *begin* using them with a right one: which is not the case.

Sup. But did you not say, that for an awakened sinner at least, to use them with such a heart as he had, often produced a good effect?

Inv. Yes. Yet it is not *certain*, that such an effect, if produced, would lead him to submit his heart to God, for, often, such is not the case with sinners. But, *to tell* him that such will *most* likely be the effect of using them with a heart unreconciled to God, would, as I said before, not only do no good, but would rather be a sure way to prevent such an effect?

Sup. But, after all, is it not just as proper for a sinner to use the means of salvation with a wrong heart, as it is for him to eat, work, or provide for his family with such a heart? And do you hesitate to allow and to tell those whom you know to be unregenerate, to do these things?

Inv. As to propriety, there certainly is none in either case. How can there be a propriety in a man's doing any thing with a heart unreconciled to God? And to tell the unregenerate, to do these things, is what I do not hesitate to do; neither, you should remember, do I hesitate to tell them to use the means of salvation; but I would avoid inti-

mating to them that they may use them with any other than a right disposition. For an inspired writer says, the *plowing* of the wicked is sin, as well as his sacrifice an abomination. And another, that whether ye *eat*, or *drink*, or *whatever* ye do, *do all to the glory of God.* Now this is just what I would have them to understand, when I tell them to do *any* thing, though I do not always stop to inform them of it. And whether they do any thing with a right heart or not, is what I am not to see to, or account for.

Sup. But do you not teach your children to pray, and read the Bible, and do you not require them to attend family and public worship; while you know they have not holy hearts?

Inv. Certainly, certainly. You seem constantly to have the idea, that I would never tell a sinner to do any of these things. But I am as strenuous that they should do them, as you are. All I contend for is, that they should do them with no other than a right disposition. When I teach my children to pray, read the Bible, and attend family and public worship, I teach them to do it with humble, penitent hearts, and with a filial disposition; telling them that otherwise God will not be pleased with and accept them. This is as far as I can or ought to go. Whether or not they perform them with such hearts and dispositions, is what I must leave between them and God. But I dare not intimate to them that if they will not perform them thus, they may do it differently. Am not I correct?

Sup. Why, yes, I don't know but you are; but——is it not *less sinful*, to use them with a wrong heart, than not use them at all?

Inv. To this I say, 1. If it is, they may not be allowed to use them with such a heart, any more than they may be allowed to commit a lesser sin, if they will not commit a greater. It is better, to be sure, or rather I will say it is not so bad, to commit the lesser as the greater; and if one *must* be done, it is more desirable, certainly, it should be the former. But 2, they ought not to do either, or have it intimated to them that they may, for this would imply that they might delay being reconciled to God. 3. It is not certan that it *is* less sinful. In some instances it may, and in some it may not be.

Sup. If what you have said on this subject is correct, and I am not certain but it is, it will follow that *all*, sinners as well as saints, must use the means of salvation with the *same disposition*, and hence for the *same purpose*, viz. of becoming more holy, and not beginning to be holy in heart. Is this your idea?

Inv. It is; *so far as it respects individuals separately considered;* for, to tell a person to use means with a right disposition, *in order to have* a right disposition, in his *own* heart, appears to me rather a strange idea. Though I have no objections, to his undertaking to do it, provided he will do it with a right disposition. But considering them collectively, it is certainly the duty of each one, with a right disposition to use all proper means to induce others to become holy immediately.

Sup. But it seems to me, that this last idea, viz. that it is the duty of every one, sinner as well as saint, so far as his influence extends, to use means *with a right* disposition, in order to excite right dispositions in *others*, is full as strange an idea as the other

you mentioned; for if *all* should do so, there would be no *others* with whom to use means, that is, if all should do their duty, there would be no opportunity to do it!

Inv. Well, Superficius, I must say you begin to be a little more acute and deep in your reasonings than usual. But you confound my meaning. There are *two* duties contained in my expression, the second depending on the first; but your reasoning seems to go on the supposition that there is but one. The first duty, which I mentioned as binding on all, was for each one to have a right disposition himself. The second, that each, so far as his influence extends, should endeavor to excite such a disposition in others, *provided*, there were any others in whom it did not already exist, that is, provided there were any who did not perform the first duty. But if *every one* should perform the first duty, the second, of course, could not be binding, that is, could not be a duty. But, brother, I must leave you; as I have just at this time an engagement. If you wish for further information on this subject, I must refer you to that excellent dissertation of Dr. Spring's, which is just published. I hope, however, that the little interview we have had may be profitable to each of us. We should ever be careful in treating this subject to avoid the extreme on the one hand, that a sinner is not to use means till *after* he loves God, and, on the other, that he may use them *before*. The middle course is doubtless the true one, viz. that *while* he uses them he must love him, and while he loves him, he must use them. F. C. R.

For the Christian Magazine.

MR. BALFOUR'S OPINION OF THE DEVIL, CARRIED OUT.

Messrs. Editors,

As Mr. Balfour has been pleased to favor the world with several publications, in which he has attempted to display much talent and learning, he is doubtless willing that his assertions should be put to the test of *common sense*; especially as he pretends to make this a capital rule by which to try the sentiments of others. It must, also, be rather ungrateful not to take some notice of *his* works, as well as other current publications, seeing he has taken so much pains to show that the Scriptures are wrongly translated, and that there is no such thing as a real being called the Devil or Satan. I shall, therefore, with your leave, devote a few numbers to the reading of the Scriptures, according to Mr. B.'s translation in his second "Inquiry," in which he endeavors to teach the *true* "doctrine of devils," and from which we may doubtless derive much light and new instruction. MATHETES.

THE first Devil, or Satan, which Mr. B. introduces, he calls by the name *lust*. After stating many things to show, as he supposes, what is represented by the *serpent*, in the third chapter of Genesis, he proceeds to say, p. 26, "I shall now state for candid consideration my own opinion on this subject." He then cites some of those passages in which the serpent is represented as deceiving Eve, and observes, "It will now be said, *allowing all this to be true, what was it that deceived Eve, and which Moses here represents by the subtilty of the serpent?* I answer, *lust* or *desire* in Eve, for what is lust but desire?" p. 27. Now admitting this to be

:, and adapted to the account
n by Moses, it will read in
following manner: 'Now
lust was more subtil than any
st of the field which the Lord
had made. And he (lust)
unto the woman, Yea, hath
said, Ye shall not eat of
ry tree of the garden? And
woman said unto the *lust* or
re, We may eat of the fruit of
trees of the garden: but of
tree that is in the midst of
garden, God hath said, Ye
l not eat of it, neither shall
touch it, lest ye die. And
lust or *desire* said unto the
nan, Ye shall not surely die:
God doth know that in the
ye eat thereof, then your
s shall be opened: and ye
l be as gods, knowing good and
. And when the woman saw
the tree was good for food,
that it was pleasant to the eyes,
a tree to be *desired*, or *lusted*
or *serpented* to make one
:, she took of the fruit there-
nd did eat, and gave also un-
er husband with her, and he
eat.'——Verse 9. 'And the
d God called unto Adam, and
unto him, Where art thou?
he said, I heard thy voice in
garden; and I was afraid,
nuse I was naked; and I hid
elf. And he said, Who told
: that thou wast naked? Hast
i eaten of the tree, whereof
:ommanded thee that thou
ildest not eat? And the man
, The woman whom thou
est to be with me, she gave
of the tree, and I did eat.
the Lord God said unto the
nan, What is this that thou
: done? And the woman said,
: *lust* or *desire* beguiled me,
I did eat. And the Lord God
unto the *lust* or *desire*, Be-
se thou hast done this, thou
cursed above all cattle, and
above every beast of the field:
upon thy belly shalt thou go, and
dust shalt thou eat all the days of
thy life: And I will put enmity
between thee (*lust* or *desire*) and
the woman, and between thy
seed and her seed: it shall bruise
thy head, (*lust* or *desire*) and thou
(*lust* or *desire*) shalt bruise his
heel. Unto the woman he said,
I will greatly multiply thy sor-
row and thy conception; in sor-
row shalt thou bring forth chil-
dren; and thy *lust*, *desire* or *ser-
pent* shall be to thy husband, and
he shall rule over thee.'

The next passage, in which the term Satan occurs as a proper name, is, 1 Chron. xi. 1, "And Satan stood up against Israel, and provoked David to number Israel." On this passage, Mr. B. comes to the conclusion, p. 43, that the term Satan *may mean* "some evil desire or passion" in the mind of David, or "some human adversary;" "nor," says he, "would it be very strange that the anger of Jehovah was in this passage the Satan referred to." Though Mr. B. appears at a loss to determine who or what *is* meant by "Satan," in this passage, yet, after his laboured criticism, we may doubtless venture to read it thus: and 'some evil desire or passion in his own mind,' or 'some human adversary,' or 'the anger of Jehovah, stood up against Israel, and provoked David to number Israel.'

The next remarkable passage, where the term Satan is introduced as representing a real person or being, occurs in the first and second chapters of the book of Job. Here Mr. B. gives his own repeated assertions, that the book of Job was written to refute the heathenish notion of an evil being, called Ahraman, and

which he is pleased to call, "*the Christian's Devil.*" He is under the necessity, however, of supposing, that the term Satan, used in the first and second chapters must allude to *something*, and chooses, therefore, pp. 57—58, that the Sabean and Chaldean freebooters should receive this appellation. In order to obtain the *true* SENSE of the passage, then, we may read it in the following manner: 'Now there was a day when the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord, and the Sabean and Chaldean freebooters came also among them. And the Lord said unto the Sabean and Chaldean freebooters, Whence comest *thou?* Then the Sabean and Chaldean freebooters answered the Lord and said, From going to and fro in the earth, and from walking up and down in it. And the Lord said unto the Sabean and Chaldean freebooters, Hast *thou* considered my servant Job, that there is none like him in the earth, a perfect and an upright man, one that feareth God, and escheweth evil? Then the Sabean and Chaldean freebooters answered the Lord, and said, Doth Job fear God for nought? Hast not thou made an hedge about him, and about his house, and about all that he hath on every side? Thou hast blessed the work of his hands, and his substance is increased in the land. But put forth thine hand now, and touch all that he hath, and he will curse thee to thy face. And the Lord said unto the Sabean and Chaldean freebooters, Behold, all that he hath is in thy power; only upon himself put not forth *thine* hand. So the Sabean and Chaldean freebooters went forth from the presence of the Lord.'—'Again there was a day when the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord, and the Sabean and Chaldean freebooters came also among them to present *himself* before the Lord. And the Lord said unto the Sabean and Chaldean freebooters, from whence comest thou? And the Sabean and Chaldean freebooters answered the Lord and said, from going to and fro in the earth, and from walking up and down in it. And the Lord said unto the Sabean and Chaldean freebooters, Hast *thou* considered my servant Job, that there is none like him in the earth, a perfect and an upright man, one that feareth God and escheweth evil? And still he holdeth fast his integrity, although *thou* movest me against him, to destroy him without cause. And the Sabean and Chaldean freebooters answered the Lord and said, skin for skin, yea, all that a man hath will he give for his life. But put forth thine hand now, and touch his bone and his flesh, and he will curse thee to thy face. And the Lord said unto the Sabean and Chaldean freebooters, Behold he is in *thine* hand, but save his life. So went the Sabean and Chaldean freebooters forth from the presence of the Lord, *and smote Job with sore boils from the sole of his foot unto his crown.*'

The next passage, to which we may turn our attention, is Ps. cix. 4, "For my love they are my adversaries: but I give myself unto prayer." Now as the original of the term adversary, (though here in the plural,) is the same as that, which in the 6th verse is translated, or, as Mr. B. says, is left untranslated, *Satan*, Mr. B. concludes that they must both mean the same thing. Indeed, whoever will take the trouble to consult his "Inquiry,"

will find him to insist, that the terms *Satan* and *adversary* are synonymous. He also asserts, p. 62, respecting verse 6th, that "in the Jewish mode of parallelism, a wicked man in the first part of the verse, is the same as Satan in the second." But Mr. B. cannot deny, on his own ground, that the pronouns *he* and *him*, in this and some of the following verses, refer to adversary, or adversaries, previously mentioned. Now, if *adversary*, and *Satan*, and *wicked man*, are *synonymous*, we may safely read the whole in the following manner, without destroying or even injuring the sense: 'For my love they are my Satans: but I give myself unto prayer. And Satans have rewarded me evil for good, and hatred for my love. Set thou a Satan over Satan; and let Satan stand at Satan's right hand. When Satan shall be judged, let Satan be condemned: and let Satan's prayer become sin. Let Satan's days be few; and let another take Satan's office. Let Satan's children be fatherless, and let Satan's wife be a widow. Let Satan's children be continually vagabonds and beg: let them seek their bread also out of their desolate places. Let the extortioner catch all that Satan hath; and let the stranger spoil Satan's labour. Let there be none to extend mercy unto Satan: neither let there be any to favour Satan's fatherless children. Let Satan's posterity be cut off; and in the generation following, let their name be blotted out. Let the iniquity of Satan's fathers be remembered with the Lord; and let not the sin of Satan's mother be blotted out. Let them be before the Lord continually, that he may cut off the memory of them from the earth. Because that Satan remembered not to show mercy, but persecuted the poor and needy man, that Satan might even slay the broken in heart. As Satan loved cursing, so let it come unto him: as Satan delighted not in blessing, so let it be far from him. As Satan clothed himself with cursing like as with his garment, so let it come into Satan's bowels like water, and like oil into his bones. Let it be unto Satan as the garment which covereth him, and for a girdle wherewith he is girded continually. Let this be the reward of my Satans from the Lord, and of them that speak evil against my soul.' Verse 29th, 'Let my Satans be clothed with shame, and let them cover themselves with their own confusion as with a mantle.'

The last passage in the Old Testament to which our attention is called, is, Zech. iii. 1, 2. Mr. B. says, p. 63, that Satan, mentioned in these verses, means Tatnai and Shethar-boznai, whose names are recorded in Ezra, chapters 5th and 6th. We may therefore, have the sense of the passage by reading it thus: 'And he showed me Joshua the high priest standing before the angel of the Lord, and Tatnai, and Shethar-boznai, standing at his right hand to resist him. And the Lord said unto Tatnai and Shethar-boznai, the Lord rebuke *thee*, O Tatnai and Shethar-boznai, even the Lord that hath chosen Jerusalem rebuke *thee:* is not this a brand plucked out of the fire?' But, if *Satan* and *adversary* mean the *same thing*, as Mr. B. contends, and we admit the marginal reading, "*to be an adversary unto him*," we can read the passage in this manner: 'And he showed me Joshua the high priest standing before the angel of the Lord, and adversary standing at

his right hand to be an adversary unto him. And the Lord said unto adversary, the Lord rebuke thee, O adversary,' &c. Again, because Satan and adversary are synonymous, we may read it thus: 'And he showed me Joshua the high priest standing before the angel of the Lord, and Satan standing at his right hand to be a Satan unto him.' Again, if Satan and adversary, in this passage, mean Tatnai and Shethar-boznai, we may give the passage another reading, which will doubtless throw still more light upon that "*old serpent, which is the devil and Satan.*" 'And he showed me Joshua the high priest standing before the angel of the Lord, and Tatnai and Shethar-boznai, standing at his right hand to be Tatnai and Shethar-boznai unto him.'

From Hall's Polemicks.

HEROISM OF THE ATHEIST.

[Extract from a Review of Foster's Essays.]

In tracing the steps by which some have arrived at the last stage of daring impiety, the denial of a God, Mr. Foster evinces in a masterly manner the presumption of the atheist, and places the extreme absurdity of pretending to demonstrate the non-existence of a Deity, in a light in which we do not remember to have seen it exhibited. Speaking of a pretended heroism attached to atheistic impiety, he adds,

"But, indeed, it is heroism no longer, if he *knows* that there is no God. The wonder then turns on the great process by which a man could grow to the immense intelligence that can know that there is no God. What ages, and what lights are requisite for THIS attainment? This intelligence involves the very attributes of divinity, while a God is denied. For, unless this man is omnipresent, unless he is at this moment in every place in the universe, he cannot know but there may be in some place manifestations of a Deity by which even *he* would be overpowered. If he does not know absolutely every agent in the universe, the one that he does not know may be God. If he is not himself the chief agent in the universe, and does not know what is so, that which is so may be God. If he is not in absolute possession of all the propositions that constitute universal truth, the one which he wants may be, that there is a God. If he cannot, with certainty, assign the cause of all that exists, that cause may be a God. If he does not know every thing that has been done in the immeasurable ages that are past, some things may have been done by a God. Thus, unless he knows all things, that is, precludes another Deity by being one himself, he cannot know that the Being whose existence he rejects does not exist. But he must *know* that he does not exist, else he deserves equal contempt and compassion for the temerity with which he firmly avows his rejection, and acts accordingly."

LOVER OF MONEY.

Meditate on the final condition to which the lover of money is hastening. The *covetous*, the man who is under the dominion of the love of money, *shall not inherit the kingdom of God.* In the present life he has a foretaste of the fruits of his sin. He is restless, anxious, dissatisfied: at one time harrassed by uncertainty as to the probable result of his pro-

jects; at another, soured by the failure of them; at another, disappointed in the midst of success by discerning, too late, that the same exertions employed in some other line of advantage would have been more productive. But suppose him to have been, thro' life, as free from the effects of these sources of vexation as the most favorable picture could represent him. *He shall not inherit the kingdom of God.* He may not have been a miser; but he was a lover of money. He may not have been an extortioner; but he was a lover of money. He may not have been fraudulent; but he was a lover of money. *He shall not inherit the kingdom of God.* He has had his day and his object. He has sought, and he may have accumulated, earthly possessions. By their instrumentality he may have gratified many other appetites and desires. But he did not seek first the kingdom of God; therefore he shall not obtain it. He *loved the world;* therefore he *shall perish with the world.* He has wilfully bartered his soul for money. In vain is he now aghast at his former madness. In vain does he now detest the idol which he worshipped. The gate of salvation is closed against him. He inherits the bitterness of unavailing remorse, the horrors of eternal death.—*Gisborne's Sermons.*

PARTY SPIRIT.

During the present disjointed state of things, nothing remains, but for every one to whom the care of any part of the Church of Christ is intrusted, to exert himself to the utmost in the promotion of vital religion, in cementing the friendship of the good, and repressing, with a firm and steady hand, the heats and eruptions of party spirit. He will find sufficient employment for his time and his talents, in inculcating the great truths of the Gospel, and endeavoring to 'form Christ' in his hearers, without blowing the flames of contention, or widening that breach which is already the disgrace and calamity of the Christian name. Were our efforts uniformly to take this direction, there would be an *identity* in the impression made by religious instruction; the distortion of party features would gradually disappear, and Christians would every where approach toward that ideal beauty spoken of by painters, which is combined of the finest lines and traits conspicuous in individual forms. Since they have all drank into the same spirit, it is manifest nothing is wanting, but a larger portion of that spirit, to lay the foundation of a solid, cordial union. It is to the immoderate attachment to secular interest, the love of power, and the want of reverence for truth, not to the obscurities of Revelation, we must impute the unhappy contentions among Christians—maladies, which nothing can correct, but deep and genuine piety. The true *schismatic* is not so properly the person who declines a compliance with what he judges to be wrong, though he may be mistaken in that judgment, as the man who sedulously employs every artifice to alienate the affections of good men from each other.—*Hall's Polemicks.*

ANECDOTE OF HUME.

David Hume observed, that all the devout persons he had ever

met with were melancholy. On this Bishop Horne remarked; this might very probably be; for in the first place, it is most likely that he saw very few, his friends and acquaintances being of another sort; and, secondly, the sight of him would make a devout man melancholy at any time.

APHORISMS.

TRUE goodness is not without that germ of greatness that can bear with patience the mistakes of the ignorant, and the censures of the malignant. The approbation of God is her "*exceeding great reward*," and she would not debase a thing so precious, by an association with the contaminating plaudits of men.

No man ever offended his own conscience but first or last it was avenged upon him for it.

Reviews.

For the Christian Magazine.

REVIEW OF TRACTS *published by the American Unitarian Association.*

[Continued from page 222.]

THE next writer with whom we have to do is Rev. Orville Dewey of New Bedford, in a Tract entitled "The Unitarian's Answer." Originally, we presume, this Tract was a Sermon, from 1 Pet. iii. 15. "*Be ready always to give an answer*," &c. It was "first published by the New Bedford Book and Tract Association," and has now passed to its "third edition." The object of it is to exhibit the *reasons*, why Unitarians prefer their own system of religion to all others. "These reasons," says the author, are the two following, viz. "the system which we have embraced is, in our judgment, more *true*, and more *useful*, than the systems which prevail around us."

Before entering on an examination of these general reasons, it is natural to inquire, and indeed necessary to determine, what the Unitarian system is: for unless we know what the system is, how can we estimate the force of reasons to induce us to embrace it? But to this most reasonable inquiry, we are furnished with no explicit answer; and we are under the necessity of proceeding to the body of the work, and of spelling out what Unitarianism is, from among the reasons advanced to support it. In doing this, we are impressed more than ever with the propriety of a description once given of Unitarianism, that it "consists rather in *not believing*;"* since, having diligently examined the pages before us, with a view to discover what it is, we can now tell of little more than what it is not—than what it rejects and discards from the religious system of our venerated Fathers. It rejects, first of all, the doctrine of the Trinity, inculcating, not only (in common with other systems) the unity of God, but that there are no personal distinctions in the Godhead. It rejects the divinity of the Saviour, receiving him merely in his *official* character, without pretending to know how long he has lived, or what may be his particular rank in the scale of created beings. "From the stones, God could raise up children to Abra-

* This description was given by a Unitarian of Boston.

ham; and *from the dust, he could raise up a Saviour.* Suppose that his existence *did commence with his birth;* he might be none the less invested with all needful power." (p. 18.) Unitarianism farther rejects the proper atonement of Christ; regarding his death "as an example of virtue," or, if we please, "a sacrifice in the cause of virtue." It rejects also the scriptural view of human depravity; "believing that this depravity is great and lamentable, but not that it is native or total." It rejects the kindred doctrine of a radical and instantaneous moral change; preferring to consider conversion a progressive work, varying in its nature and character according to the varying circumstances of those who are its subjects.*

Such then is Unitarainism; and now for the *reasons* why the abettors of this system receive it, in preference to all others. "Our first and great reason," says Mr. D., "is, that in our apprehension it is *truer* than any other system." But what are we to understand by this singular mode of expression? "*Truer* than any other system!" Some other system then may be true; but Unitarianism is truer; and a third, yet undiscovered perhaps, may be the truest; and still not even this may be *the truth!* But not to appear captious;—how does Mr. D. evince that his is the truer system?—He begins with the Unitarian view of the Divine Being, and asserts that this is, first, "the *simple* doctrine of the Bible;" second, "the *unembarrassed* doctrine of the Bible;" and third, "the *current* doctrine of the Bible." But what does he mean by its being "the *simple* doctrine of the Bible?" That the idea of one God existing in one person is more simple than that commonly received by Trinitarians? And what if it is? Is it on this account the more true? Do the Scriptures exhibit the Divine Being as a specially simple object of thought, presenting nothing mysterious, nothing difficult, to the contemplative mind? Certainly not, but the contrary. "*Canst thou by searching find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection? It is high as heaven; what canst thou do? deeper than hell; what canst thou know?*" —If the proper meaning of Mr. Dewey's first proposition has here been given, it obviously proves nothing to his purpose; and we can conceive of no other meaning, without running it into the second, viz. that his is "the *unembarrassed* doctrine of the Bible."—But is it possible that he finds no *embarrassment*, in squaring his views of the Supreme Being, with those presented in the holy Scriptures? Has he none from the mass of evidence, so often exhibited, in proof of the supreme divinity of the Son, and Spirit? When the Son is called, not only God and Lord, but "the mighty God," the "true God," the "God over all," the "Jehovah of Israel"—when all the attributes of the Deity are appropriated to

* "With regard to *divine influence*," says Mr. D., "we firmly believe in it; only we maintain that it is strictly accommodated to the human powers, to human agency and freedom. And *election* we do not object against, if men are elected to be Christians, just as they are elected to be merchants or philosophers—in perfect conformity with their own choice, endeavour, and moral action. And *perseverance* we do not oppose, but plead for, if the doctrine be, that he only is a good man who is perseveringly good." pp. 35, 36.

him, and all the works of the Deity are ascribed to him, and all the honors of the Deity are offered to him—still, does Mr. D. find no embarrassment in saying and showing, that there is but one person in the Godhead, and that this person is the Father? Does he find no embarrassment from those many passages, in which the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, are spoken of together, as distinctively concerned in the work of our redemption? "Baptizing them in name of the *Father*, and of the *Son*, and of the *Holy Ghost*." "Elect, according to the foreknowledge of *God the Father*, through sanctification of the *Spirit*, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of *Christ*." "The grace of our *Lord Jesus Christ*, and the love of *God*, and the communion of the *Holy Ghost*, be with you all." "Through *him* (Christ) we both have access, by one *Spirit*, unto the *Father*."* Remarking upon one of the passages commonly urged in proof of the divinity of Christ,† Mr. D. observes, "To *some other translation we are urged*, or else to the *entire suspension of our judgment*, by the monstrous incongruities and contradictions of the popular explanation." (p. 11.) That is, 'Another translation must be forced upon this passage, or we cannot tell what it means—we cannot explain it, consistently with Unitarian sentiments.' And yet Mr. D. would persuade us that he finds no embarrassment, in rejecting the divinity of the Son of God!

But he proceeds to urge, that his is "the *current* doctrine of Scripture;" and in proof of this, he tells us in how many hundred passages the supreme divinity of the Father is set forth; and in how many hundred more the Son is represented as "subordinate to the Father." (p. 14.) But does he really believe that Trinitarians deny the supreme divinity of the Father; or that they do not regard the Son as in some sense subordinate, and even inferior to the Father? If his hundreds of passages, on these subjects, were increased to thousands, they would prove nothing to his purpose—nothing which we do not believe, as firmly as himself. It is perfectly vain for Unitarians to think of pressing us with proof-texts such as these; since they bear not at all on the question between us, but go merely to establish some of the essential parts of our own religious system.

In contradiction to the assertions of Mr. D., we feel it incumbent on us to say, that the Trinitarian doctrine is the *only* one which meets all the representations of the inspired volume, particularly in regard to the *person of Christ*. It meets those in which he is represented as God, and in which he is represented as man, and in which he is represented as the Mediator between God and man. It meets those in which he is represented as equal with the Father, and in which he is represented as inferior to him. It meets those in which he is represented as one with the Father, and in which he is represented as distinct from him.

The various representations of Scripture respecting the person of Christ, it is thought may be compared to a lock, the wards of which are so constructed, that but one key can possibly be made to fit them. Apply the sentiment that Christ is God, and nothing

* Matt. xxviii. 19. 1 Peter, i. 2. 2 Cor. xiii. 14. Eph. ii. 18.

† Rom. ix. 5. "*Christ, who is over all, God blessed forever.*"

else, and the key will not suit. It will turn indeed a little way, but cannot be forced round. It meets those passages which speak of the Saviour's divinity, but is irreconcilable with others which speak of his humanity.—Apply next the doctrine of Christ's mere humanity, and this does not suit. This will turn very well a little way, but no strength or artifice can bring it round. This meets those passages which speak of the Saviour's humanity, but is inconsistent with others which speak of his divinity.—Apply next the various keys of the other, and (as they are sometimes thought) higher classes of Unitarians, and none of these will suit. They may indeed be driven thro' some particular parts of the lock, but they turn easily nowhere, and it is impossible, without breaking, to force them through the whole. The only key which is known, or can be conceived of, which will perfectly suit in every part, is the sentiment advanced by Trinitarians, that *Christ unites, in his person, both divinity and humanity.* With this idea, all the passages which speak of him are consistent. In this, they all perfectly harmonize; and thus evince that this is indeed the revelation which God hath given us of his Son.

Mr. D. objects to the Trinitarian system, that, on this ground, Christ must have *humbled* himself to undertake the mediatorial work; whereas the Scriptures speak of him, in his appointment to this work, as being greatly *honored* and *exalted.* "Him hath God *exalted* to be a Prince and a Saviour." "God hath highly *exalted* him, and given him a name that is above every name."—But Mr. D. ought to know there is another class of passages, which assert that Christ actually *did humble himself*, when he assumed the office of Mediator. "Though he was rich, yet, for your sakes, he *became poor.*" "Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but *made himself of no reputation*, and *took upon him the form of a servant*, and *was made in the likeness of men;* and, being found in fashion as a man, he *humbled himself*, and *became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.*"—It is the happiness of our system, that it meets and harmonizes both these classes of passages; while it is the misfortune of the Unitarian system, that it meets, at best, but one of them. As *man*, Christ was "highly exalted," in being made "a Prince and a Saviour;" but as *God*, he greatly humbled himself, when he "took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men," and entered upon his mediatorial work. It is characteristic of the Trinitarian system, and of this only, that it is in agreement with all the representations which are given of Christ, in the inspired volume.

From the doctrine of the Trinity, Mr. D. passes to that of the *atonement.* He resolves the death of Christ into a mere *mean of grace*, intended to promote our deliverance from sinful practices, and to furnish motives in favor of holiness. Christ died, he says, first, "as an example of virtue;" second, "that he might rise again, and thus confirm the truth of his mission;" and third, as "a sacrifice in the cause of human virtue," and to furnish "a strong and affecting pledge of God's mercy" to men. (pp. 27—30.) That some of the objects here mentioned were accomplished by the death of Christ, no one doubts; but the question is,

either of them, or do they all, constitute the *great* purpose and object for which he died? He exhibited an *example* of patient and submissive suffering, we admit; but can it be conceived that he endured the agonies of the cross, for this purpose merely? Did any one else ever die for such an object? Thousands have met their last enemy with exemplary patience, submission, and fortitude; but whoever died for the mere purpose of setting such an example? The *resurrection* of Christ was consequent upon his death; but so also it was upon his life and birth. And it may be said as truly, that he could not have risen, had he not been born and lived, as that he could not have risen had he not died. But Christ died, we are told, "as a *sacrifice* in the cause of human virtue." This form of expression has been adopted, we presume, for the purpose of lugging in the word *sacrifice*, which is so often used, in the Scriptures, in reference to the death of Christ. But the word, as here used, has nothing of its appropriate scriptural signification. Christ died a "sacrifice in the cause of human virtue,"—just as Warren died a sacrifice in the cause of American freedom; or as Martyn died a sacrifice in the cause of Missions.—Christ's death, we are farther told, "is a strong and affecting pledge of God's mercy to men." But could God in no way satisfy men that he was merciful, but by such a tremendous token as the blood of his Son? Would they not believe his *word* on this point—a point to which, of all others, they might be supposed to be, and in fact have been, most inclined to give credence? Would they persist in regarding him as unfeeling, unmerciful, unless he brought his Son to the cross, to satisfy them of the contrary?

Mr. D., in common with other Unitarians, regards an atonement through the blood of Christ as wholly unnecessary; since "forgiveness is the direct and unavoidable consequence of repentance and holiness." (p. 25.) But if forgiveness, or justification (which means the same) is "the direct and unavoidable consequence of repentance and holiness," then, in what sense are men not justified by their own performances? And what is the ground of the distinction, so much insisted on by the Apostle Paul, between being justified by faith, and by works? And farther; if "forgiveness is the direct and unavoidable consequence of repentance and holiness," then why, in the matter of forgiveness, is so much stress laid upon the *blood*, and the *death* of Christ? "This is my *blood* of the New Testament, which is shed for many *for the remission of sins*." "We have redemption through his *blood*, *the forgiveness of sins*." "Unto him who hath loved us, and *washed us from our sins in his own blood*."*

Regarding the atonement as unnecessary, Mr. D. denies, as we might expect, that any atonement has ever been made. He denies that the sufferings of Christ are represented anywhere in the Scriptures, as "rendering it consistent with the divine character or government to forgive sinners." (p. 25.) But what will he make of the following representation of the Apostle Paul? "Whom (Christ) God hath set forth to be a *propitiation*," or *propitiatory sacrifice*, "through faith in his blood." For what purpose? "*To declare his righteousness, for the remission of sins*

* Mat. xxvi. 28. Eph. i. 7. Rev. v. 9.

that are past, through the forbearance of God; *to declare*, I say, at this time *his righteousness*." But why must his righteousness be declared? "*That he might be just*, and yet *the justifier of him who believeth in Jesus*." And what will he make of the declaration, that "*without the shedding of blood, there is no remission?*" There was none under the former shadowy dispensation; and there is none under the present, in which the substance has come, and the shadows are no more. And do not all those passages, which represent us as forgiven *through Christ*, and *for his sake*, necessarily imply that we could consistently be forgiven in no other way? Would Christ have died to open a way of forgiveness, when there was no necessity for such a sacrifice?

The next subject, on which Mr. D. regards his system as "truer" than that of the Orthodox, is *human depravity*. He seems to be aware that the Bible, literally interpreted, inculcates the total sinfulness of unsanctified men. But he adds, "The expressions which are quoted" in proof of this point, "are evidently the language, not of philosophical discrimination, but of strong feeling." (p. 33.) Consequently, as we are left to infer, they are not worthy to be believed.

The argument on which he chiefly relies, in opposing the doctrine of total depravity, is that "from reason, from experience, and observation." And to what does this amount? Why, in the first place, that "the *native principles* in man, such as the desire of physical enjoyment, of happiness, of power, of esteem, of knowledge—that the principle of self-defence—with the faculties of reason, conscience, memory," &c. are not sinful. (p. 32.) And nobody ever supposed they were. These native principles and faculties are possessed by the worst men, as well as by the best—they belong to our constitutions, and not to our characters—and no believer in total depravity, who understood the subject, ever regarded them as, of necessity, either sinful or holy.—But Mr. D. insists farther, that "good and holy *affections* are natural to men." And how does this appear? In general, from the fact, that we have something within us, which approves of what is right, and is affected with what is particularly generous, in the conduct of men. But is the approbation here spoken of, that of the conscience, or the heart; and are the affections referred to a part of the moral character, or the mere workings of animal feeling? In determining this point, it is not safe to appeal, as Mr. D. does, to the *consciousness* of individuals, but rather to the *fruit* which is exhibited in their conversation and lives. And having this for a criterion, we assert, without fear of contradiction, that the marks of holy affection suggested by Mr. D. appear not unfrequently in palpably vicious men—in men, who make no effectual efforts to *be* what they approve, or to imitate those acts of humanity and generosity, with which they are so much affected; —thus evincing that these are no marks of true holiness, and are not at all inconsistent with the divine declaration, that "the hearts of the sons of men are *full of evil*."

With the views which Mr. D. has expressed on the subject of depravity, his ideas of *conversion* cannot but be, in our apprehension, unscriptural. He talks in-

deed about conversion, but it amounts to but little more than talk. For if "good and holy affections are natural to men," *from what* shall they be converted? And *to what* shall they be converted? If their holy, natural affections are inconstant and imperfect, they may indeed be improved and perfected; but they cannot be, in the scriptural sense, *converted*—they cannot experience a radical and permanent moral change. Accordingly Mr. D. denies that *all* Christians ever do experience such a change; and that any are converted from total sinfulness to the first exercise of holiness. And yet how expressly is such a change inculcated and insisted on, in the holy Scriptures? "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." "Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven."*

Mr. D. resolves his reasons for regarding Unitarianism as the more *useful* system of religion, into a series of "objections to the popular or Orthodox instructions of the day." These objections are ranged under three heads; first, "a want of discrimination;" second, "a want of enlarged and liberal views;" and third, "a want of real and close dealing with the conscience." (p. 37.)

The "want of discrimination," with which Orthodox ministers are considered chargeable, consists, it appears, in their adhering too strictly, to "the language of the Apostles," and in applying their language "too indiscriminately." "The terms *believing, being born again, being brought out of darkness into marvellous light*"—the regarding enlightened congregations as composed of "two classes, *believers* and *unbelievers*, *penitent* and *impenitent*, *saints* and *sinners*"—and the Apostolic exhortation, "*Be not conformed to the world*"—although they might have been very well in the time of the Apostles—yet, in the opinion of Mr. D., ought now to be discarded. But on this subject, we trust he may set his heart at rest. The ground of his complaint against Orthodox ministers, is one on which they feel entitled to glory. They love the language of the Apostles, and will strenuously adhere to it; because, in the first place, it is the language of *inspiration*—the language suggested by the Holy Ghost; and because it expresses, with admirable precision, the *sense* which they intend to convey. We do verily believe that enlightened congregations, at the present day, like those in the age of the Apostles, are divided into two great moral classes, believers and unbelievers, saints and sinners—that when any sinner becomes a saint, he is, in the sense of Scripture, "born again," and "brought out of darkness into marvellous light"—and that those who are thus changed have need to be exhorted not to be "conformed to the world;" and believing this, why should we not speak of it in the language of Scripture? What better language can we think to devise, than that which was taught, not by the wisdom of man, but by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost?

In his complaint on the subject of conformity to the world, Mr. D. has some sentences which we feel constrained to quote, as a specimen of the spirit which occasionally oozes out, through

* John iii. 3. Mat. xviii. 3.

the leaky vessel of a boasted charity.

"One of the first notions which a new convert acquires, is, that men around him, perhaps his best friends, his kindred, are enemies or despisers of him on account of his religion, and he becomes, in consequence, sour, or sanctimonious, or conceited, and at any rate, less kind, less agreeable, less modest; while he imagines that he is all the more pious and heavenly. At the same time he is taught to avoid all cheerful recreations, as the ways of the sinful world; at least all polished recreations. He may go to the military review, he may celebrate 'the Election,' or the festival of Independence; he may mingle with promiscuous crowds, amidst vulgar sports, vicious excesses, and profane oaths, and not lose his good name; but let him beware of more decent and polished amusements, as he values his Christian standing. We do not deny that recreation may be abused, as business and every thing else may be abused. Still, however, the one was designed to occupy a place in life, as much as the other. Our concern is not to extirpate but to improve the pleasures of society. And to refuse recreations to the young, and relaxation to the busy, and amusement to the toiling, is not only an unwise and an unpromising undertaking, but it is to distort the rational and cheerful religion we profess, to disparage it in the eyes of intelligent and thinking men, and to dissuade them from its duties and ordinances. And it is at the same time to hold up to Christians, a very loose and questionable standard of piety." pp. 40, 41.

A considerable part of this paragraph we declare to be utterly false and scandalous. New converts among the Orthodox are not taught to regard their "best friends, their kindred, as enemies and despisers of them, on account of their religion"—although the treatment which they sometimes receive from their former friends is of a character to rivet this impression upon them. Nor are they taught that "they may mingle with promiscuous crowds, amidst vulgar sports, vicious excesses, and profane oaths, and not lose their good name." And we can frame no excuse for a man, who has had as many opportunities as Mr. Dewey, for becoming acquainted with respectable Orthodox clergymen, who can allow himself in making such injurious assertions. The offence which has provoked them, we can indeed divine. Our ministers do not copy the example which is set them by some of the Unitarian clergy, in attending balls, and theatres, and parties of sinful pleasure; nor do they countenance an attendance upon such places, in the members of their churches. Others may, if they please, regard these amusements as "cheerful and polished recreations;" and regard those who discourage them as "distorting the rational and cheerful religion we profess." But we have not so learned Christ. And Orthodox ministers and Christians we hope will not cease to bear their testimony against all those scenes of levity and sin, which, while they gratify the dissipated and thoughtless, and nurture "the pride of life," are calculated to banish seriousness, unfit for devotion, and disgust and starve the spiritual mind.

Orthodox ministers are farther charged with "a want of enlarged and liberal views." The only instance of this mentioned, is their "setting the interests of the present world in opposition to those of the world to come," and representing a life of religion as a painful but needful *penance*, to be performed for the salvation of the soul.—But Mr. D., notwithstanding his Orthodox education, is entirely mistaken on this subject. This, we aver, is not the ground, on which Orthodox ministers urge and enforce the duties of religion. Our Saviour did indeed say, "Whosoever he be of you, that forsaketh

not *all* that he hath, cannot be my disciple." But what is the meaning? Not that those, who profess themselves the disciples of Christ, should literally and at once forsake all that they have; but that they hold all in subordination to their love of Christ, and be ready to forsake it, when he, in his providence, shall call. And Dr. Watts says, in the truly devotional lines which Mr. D. has quoted,

"I give my mortal interest up,
And make my God my all."

But what is the meaning? Not that Dr. Watts, or any other disciple, does literally and at once renounce all temporal interests and enjoyments; but that he seeks and finds his chief happiness, not in these, but in God, and is ready to renounce all, at the bidding of his Divine Master. On the subject before us, we believe, and we inculcate, the sentiment of the inspired writers, that "the ways of wisdom are ways of *pleasantness*, and all her paths are *peace*"—that "godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the *life that now is*, and of that which is to come"—and that "*in keeping* the divine commandments *there is great reward.*" We quote with full credence, and with entire approbation, the expressive lines of our Orthodox brother Doddridge,

"Live while you live, the epicure would say,
And seize the pleasures of the passing day.
Live while you live, the tatter'd monk replies,
And wait your happiness in yonder skies.
In me, dear Saviour, both united be;
I live in pleasure, while I live to thee."*

The last objection of Mr. D. to the ministrations of the Orthodox is, that they are not characterised by "real and close dealing with the *conscience*." A very singular objection, truly, to come from a Unitarian! The very same which thousands and millions among the Orthodox would make, to preaching on the other side! "It does not arouse the slumbering conscience. It does not excite and affect the heart."—If then each side accuses the other of a want of thorough and faithful dealing with the conscience, how shall the point at issue be decided? By what criterion shall it be determined, which of the two is most in fault? We know of no safer method than an appeal to facts. Under what preaching is the slumbering conscience most frequently awakened? Under what preaching is the stupid soul most frequently disquieted and alarmed? Under what preaching are there the most frequent and noticeable reformations, and the deepest apparent convictions of sin? We have no fear as to the result of an appeal like this. The instances of distress for sin, and consequent reformation, if they occur at all among Unitarians, are certainly "few and far between;" while they are of continual occurence, under the ministrations of the Orthodox.—The celebrated Dr. Chalmers may be regarded as an unexceptionable witness on this point. For twelve long years, he preached much after the manner of our Unitarians, inculcating their doctrines, and enforcing moral duties, with earnestness and eloquence; but in all this time, he declares that "he never once heard of any reformations having been effected among his people."* And it was not till he changed his style of preaching, with his sentiments, and became a determined defender of the Orthodox faith, that he was per-

* We quote from memory, and not perhaps with verbal accuracy.

* See Chalmers's Farewell Discourse to his Parishioners of Kilmany.

mitted to witness any desirable fruit of his labors.—On the question of close and faithful dealing with the conscience, we may safely appeal to the whole Unitarian community. Have they ever known persons to leave their parishes, and unite with the Orthodox, on the ground that their preaching was too close and impressive, and gave them too much uneasiness in their courses of sin? Can they point us to a single instance of this kind? But hundreds have left Orthodox parishes and joined the Unitarians, on this very ground. They could not gratify their appetites and passions, and live in pleasure as they wished, and hear the solemn, searching truths, which every returning Sabbath brought to their ears.

The Tract here reviewed is, on the whole, an able production of its kind. The style is unequal —in some places loose and careless, but in others flowing and even eloquent. The method too is not simple or clear. Still, the book is fitted to have an influence; and its whole influence, we regret to say, will be in opposition to the truth.—What a solemn responsibility those are taking upon themselves, and what a fearful account they must expect to render, who, being blessed with talents, and with the means of exerting an extended influence, are exerting all their talents, and all their influence, to subvert the doctrine of the Apostles; to spread another Gospel; and to shut out their fellow men from a spiritual acquaintance with Him, "whom to know aright is life eternal!"

We are next to consider, "A Discourse on the Evidences of Revealed Religion; by William E. Channing, D. D."—the only Tract perhaps in the series, which may not properly be termed *sectarian*. A leading object of the discourse is to meet and refute the great objection to the Christian revelation, "that *miracles are incredible*;" and that the supernatural character of an alledged fact is proof enough of its falsehood." In disposing of this objection, which we are happy to say Dr. C. has done, in a very able and satisfactory manner, he encounters, as might have been expected, the celebrated argument of Mr. Hume, in opposition to miracles. This had been previously answered by Dr. Campbell; but several considerations are here subjoined, which serve to render that answer more convincing and complete. Indeed, this argument of Hume, of which so much was once boasted, is now seen to be no better than a specious sophism—a lamentable instance of the power of prejudice, in blinding and deceiving an ingenious and inquisitive mind.—It is well observed by Dr. C., while on the subject of miracles, that "Christianity is not only confirmed by them, but is in itself, in its very essence, a *miraculous religion*." It is, what "it professes to be, a *supernatural communication from God*."

Having removed the objection against miracles, Dr. C. "proceeds to consider the *evidences* of the Christian religion;" or rather, he states and illustrates the *general principle*, into which all the evidences of Christianity may be resolved. It is merely this, that "*every effect must have an adequate cause*." The Christian religion he considers an *effect*, for which, in many points of view, no adequate cause can be assigned, except the

special interposition of the Almighty. This part of the subject, like the other, is very ably discussed, and Christianity is shown to be, "not of earthly origin, but a ray from the everlasting light; a stream from the fountain of heavenly wisdom and love."

The truth of our religion being thus established, Dr. C. concludes, in the following eloquent and impressive manner:

"This religion, if true, is the greatest of all truths, deserving and demanding our reverent attention, and fervent gratitude. This religion must never be confounded with our common blessings. It is a revelation of pardon, which, as sinners, we all need. Still more, it is a revelation of human immortality; a doctrine which, however undervalued amidst the bright anticipations of inexperienced youth,* is found to be our strength and consolation, and the only effectual spring of persevering and victorious virtue, when the realities of life have scattered our visionary hopes; when pain, disappointment, and temptation press upon us; when this world's enjoyments are found unable to quench that deep thirst of happiness which burns in every breast; when friends, whom we love as our own souls, die; and our own graves open before us.—To all who hear me, and especially to my young hearers, I would say, let the truth of this religion be the strongest conviction of your understandings; let its motives and precepts sway, with an absolute power, your characters and lives."

We regard this discourse with unqualified approbation, and should rejoice to see it in the hands of all our readers. The subject is most important, and it is treated in a manner to instruct and interest the different classes of society. Our single regret is, that one who has so well defended Christianity in the general, should be left to pervert and distort it, as we think Dr. C. has done, in some of his recent publications. But on these we forbear, at present, to remark. We thank him for the discourse here noticed; and we thank the committee of the American Unitarian Association, for giving it to the public in a cheap form. If they will publish no worse Tracts than this, the task of reviewing them will be much more pleasant than it has hitherto been, and than, we fear, it is likely to be, in the time to come.

* This discourse was delivered before the University in Cambridge, at the Dudleian Lecture, March 14, 1821.

The Assistant to Family Religion, in Six Parts: containing a Sermon on Family Religion; A System of Natural and Revealed Religion, in the form of Question and Answer, accompanied with Scripture Proofs, in Thirty Two Chapters; A Series of Resolutions, and Questions of Self Examination; Morning and Evening Prayers for every Day for Two Weeks, together with Occasional Prayers; Select Psalms and Hymns, adapted to Family Devotion; and Select Harmony, or Psalm Tunes, suitable for Family Worship. By WILLIAM COGSWELL, A. M. *Pastor of the South Church in Dedham.*—Boston: Crocker & Brewster.

IN this notice, our intention is not a critical review, but a presentation to our readers of the design and substance of the volume before us. Heads of families occupy an important station, and are under great responsibilities. On the faithful and proper discharge of their duties, more than the temporal welfare of their children and households depends, it subserves the prosperity of the churches, and the cause of religion in the world. Ministers have books, not only to *remind* them of their duties, but to aid in the discharge of them. This may be affirmed of almost all other per-

sons in the various offices which they sustain. We see not why parents and heads of families should not be assisted and furnished with all needful aid and encouragement. They should, as it appears to us, avail themselves of the best information and means which they can obtain, to assist them in the performance of those important duties that daily devolve upon them. The subject of their wants has not been entirely overlooked and disregarded by those who were able to supply them. Forms of prayer, and hymns for family devotion, have been composed, and catechisms have been put into the hands both of parents and of children; but these have been in *seperate* publications, and of course, more expensive and inconvenient. Few families only would be, it is probable, in possession of the whole of them. There was evidently need of a work that should comprise the whole subject of family religion and in a convenient form. Such a work is now before the public. The title page, which we have already given, shows that the *parts* are entire, wanting nothing. These parts are proportionate and sufficiently ample, and are executed with ability and judgment. We shall, separately but briefly, notice each of them, and in the order in which the author has arranged them.

The Sermon on family religion is well planned and executed, and is a proper introduction to the other parts of the work. We shall have but little room for extracts; but we are disposed, here, to make one from the conclusion of the discourse. After presenting the arguments in favor of family religion, and pointing out the time for its observance and the duties included in it, and after considering the manner in which it should be observed, and noticing and answering excuses which are made for the neglect of the duty, the author closes by saying,

"Let me appeal directly to those of you, who are heads of families. How do you feel, and how will you act in consideration of the vastly important object of Family Religion? Will you not suffer your houses to be temples of the living God, and, from the family altar, grateful incense to ascend to heaven, morning and evening? Will you not commence and close the day with the most excellent, and noble, and pleasurable, and heavenly services of family worship? Or will you expose yourselves to the alarming denunciation, and everlasting displeasure of the Most High? O! be entreated by the authority of the great God, by the comfort and salvation of your own souls, and of those committed to your care, and by the best interests of religion, to adopt the pious resolution of Joshua, 'As for me and my house we will serve the Lord.' Morning and evening, read the Word of God, instruct your households in the great principles of Christianity, and offer unto your Father in Heaven prayer and praise. In this entreaty, I plead for the happiness of the present and future generations;—I plead for the prosperity of Zion and the world. Let these weighty motives constrain you to discharge this delightful, this profitable, this imperious duty. Happy, thrice happy the family! where God's Word is read, where suitable instructions are given, and where prayer and praise are wont to be offered. God loveth, and will bless the dwellings of Jacob."

The second, and much the largest and most difficult part of the work, is upon the subject of natural and revealed religion. It indicates much thinking, and careful investigation, and a pervading, stirring mind, conversant with theological studies. Rarely do we find so much and such various religious instruction as is here contained in about two hundred pages. Every head of a family, disposed to teach those under his care the first principles of the oracles of God, will here find that assistance which he may need. As some evidence of the

truth of this assertion, we give the general topics of which the author treats.

"1. The existence and character of God, and the condition and duties of man, as manifested by the light of nature; 2. The Sacred Scriptures; 3. The character of God, natural and moral, as revealed in the Sacred Scriptures; 4. Trinity; 5. Purposes of God; 6. Creation; 7. Providence; 8. Angels; 9. Creation and primitive state of man; 10. Rule of obedience and life to man in his primitive state; 11. Apostacy, depravity, and lost state of man; 12. Atonement; 13. Regeneration; 14. Holy Love; 15. Repentance; 16. Faith; 17. Justification; 18. Perseverance; 19. Death; 20. Future State; 21. Resurrection; 22. Judgment; 23. Future Happiness; 24. Future Misery; 25. Means of Grace; 26. Worship; 27. Sabbath; 28. Church; 29. Baptism; 30. Lord's Supper; 31. Church Government and Discipline; 32. Millennium."

These several topics are all discussed by way of question and answer. Had we room to present the questions, which are no less than four hundred and seventy one, to our readers, they would be more convinced of the value and importance of the work which we wish to recommend to their notice. The mode which the Author has adopted, that of question and answer, is certainly the best adapted to the purpose of instruction, and admits of the most matter within the same compass. Heads of families will find the principal truths and duties of religion, collected, assorted and arranged for their use. The part of the work, now under our eye, is rendered more valuable, by the illustrations and proofs adduced from Scripture, and placed at the bottom of each page. A mere reference to chapter and verse would have been of service; but a much greater service is done by quoting the passages, and presenting them immediately to the eye of the reader. They may now be read in connexion with the doctrine, or duty, which they are brought to support. This is, obviously, a great convenience. We have examined many of the passages, with a view to satisfy ourselves whether they are pertinently introduced. The result is a conviction, that they are well selected, and either directly, or indirectly show, what they are adduced to show. They may, very generally, be relied on as proof texts. We are not prepared to affirm, that no sentiment advanced by the Author will be called in question by any of the religious community; but we do believe, that the main doctrines exhibited are according to godliness, and contained in the Scriptures of truth. In the part we are now reviewing, scarcely any thing is loosely and vaguely written. The writer has a meaning, and he definitely and clearly expresses what he means. The volume before us, and, *especially*, that part of it now under consideration, will be found highly useful to preachers, to instructors of Sabbath schools, and a proper book for the higher classes in such schools. The aid it will afford to those whom we have mentioned, will be found in the great variety of important and appropriate subjects of which it treats, in the selection of passages from the Scriptures, and in the observations which are made and the reasons which are offered as illustrations and proofs.

After making two or three extracts, we shall close what we propose to present on this division of the work. The first is taken from the Chapter on the Sacred Scriptures. The question is,

"What is the evidence, that the Bible is given by inspiration of God?"

The answer is,

"There is evidence from history;—from miracles recorded in it, wrought in the presence of competent witnesses;—from its prophecies and their fulfilment;—from the unrivalled sublimity of its language, the nature and harmony of its doctrines, and the perfect purity of its precepts;—from the glorious effects it has produced upon the hearts and lives of multitudes;—from the sacred character of its Writers;—from the propagation of Christianity;—and from the analogy there is between natural and revealed religion."

We quote the fifteenth question in the same Chapter together with the answer, because we wish the sentiment may not be forgotten by our readers.

"Are all controversies in religion, decrees of councils, opinions of ancient and modern writers, and the doctrines of private men, to be tested by the Bible?"

"*A.* They are. This is the supreme judge in all matters of religion. There can be no appeal from Scripture to reason, for this would be to exalt man above God. This grand Protestant maxim should ever be embraced and maintained."

Our next extracts are from the fourth Chapter, on the Trinity. To the question,

"Do the Scriptures teach the Doctrine of three persons in the one essence in the Godhead?"

The answer is,

"They teach, that there is one God, numerically one in essence and attributes, and that, in this one God, there is a threefold subsistence or distinction, or three persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, possessing numerically the same essence, and the same perfections, so far as made known to us. This mode of existence is peculiar to the Great Jehovah. In the one self-existent Being, there is a something, as the ground for His existing Trinity in Unity."

We have room but for one more extract from the same Chapter.

"*Q.* Is God one and three in the same sense."

"*A.* He is not. God is three in Person, but one in essence or substance;—three in one respect, but one in another. The three Persons in the Godhead do not make one Person; neither does the one God make three Gods; but the three Persons exist in one God, and the one God subsists in three Persons. God is *really*, and not *nominally*, three in Person; but not in any such sense as to be inconsistent with His being one in essence."

After a careful perusal of the twelfth chapter, which is on the Atonement, we see not that any extracts can be made that will give our readers a fair view of what the Author has witten upon this prominent and important subject of the New Testament. The whole chapter should be read in connexion. In the close of it we find a sentiment, that demands the serious consideration of all at the present day.

"*Q.* Is the doctrine of atonement taught by revelation only, or is it a dictate of reason, or the light of nature?"

"*A.* Reason and the light of nature can give no information on this subject. The doctrine of atonement is derived wholly from the sacred Scriptures. And it is this which peculiarly distinguishes the Christian religion from Deism, Mahometanism, Paganism, and all other religions. All, therefore, who reject the atonement ought not to be considered as believers in the religion of *Christ*."

We feel that it is time to repress our inclination for making extracts. After making one more on Future Misery, we resolve to desist.

"*Q.* What are the evidences, that there is a future state of misery for the finally impenitent of mankind?"

"*A.* 1. The plain and explicit declarations of the Scriptures in relation to this subject, are decisive evidence of the truth of this doctrine. 2. The opposition, made to the instructions of the Prophets, Christ, and the Apostles by the impenitent, to whom they preached, is evidence, that they did teach this doctrine. Their hearers would never have been so bitter to the truths they taught, if they had declared, that all men would be saved. 3. The concern in many for their own future salvation, produced by the preaching of the Gospel, by Christ

and His Apostles, is an evidence, that the doctrine of future punishment was taught by them. 4. The great solicitude for the salvation of souls, which the Prophets, Christ, and the Apostles manifested, proves beyond a doubt, that they believed in the doctrine of the future misery of the wicked, and that they taught it."

Passing to the third part, we find eighty resolutions, with questions for examination annexed to each of them. We feel as if no one, and especially as if no one having a concern for his own personal religion and spiritual state, can peruse them without profit. As a specimen of this part of the work, we copy the 34th and 79th resolutions, with the questions for examination.

"*Resolution.* I will consider my corporeal and mental faculties, my time, earthly possessions and influence, as the property of God, loaned to me, and I will use them as not abusing them."

"*Question.* Must I not condemn myself for the habitual violation of this resolution? Have not my idols been many? And have I not exulted in my powers and possessions?"

"*R.* I will view with pleasure the many benevolent Societies, which have been formed to promote the temporal and spiritual good of mankind, and will give them my approbation, my prayers, and my pecuniary assistance, so far as I have ability and opportunity."

"*Q.* Have I done so the year past? If the relief of human sufferings, and the spread of the Gospel depend on me and others like me, will not the poor continue to suffer, and sinners continue to die in ignorance and sin?"

The resolutions, throughout, are such as every one ought to make and to keep, and the questions upon them are fitted to bring out the state of the heart, and to lead all who attend to them to see of what manner of spirit they are.

In the fourth part, the Author has composed, for the assistance of those who need them, forms of prayers for a family, morning and evening, and for several occasions, and in a well judged variety. They are original, pertinent, comprehensive, and devotional. Although many passages of Scripture are wrought into them, yet we in no instance found the same passage occurring in different prayers.

For the Psalms and Hymns, which are about sixty in number, the Author is entitled to the praise of making a judicious selection from a variety of the best poetical works. We hope that many will be encouraged and disposed to commence and maintain singing as a part of their family worship.

The Psalm Tunes, with which the volume before us closes, are of all the variety of metres in common use in public worship. Of these, we need say nothing more than this, that they are approved by the best judges of sacred music.

The Author, it appears to us, has ably executed his design, and done an important service to the religious community, by preparing and publishing the volume before us. We are happy to learn the approbation and currency it has received during the short time it has been before the public. We wish it a continued and general circulation.

THE

CHRISTIAN MAGAZINE.

VOL. IV. SEPTEMBER, 1827. No. 9.

SERMON.

ACTS, XXVI. 9. *I verily thought with myself that I ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth.*

[Concluded from page 230.]

IMPROVEMENT.

1. IT appears from the case of Paul, that men may be to blame for their opinions as well as practice. Paul was to blame for his opinion concerning Christ. He says it was his sincere opinion, that both Christ and his followers ought to be opposed, and that he did right in opposing them. His sincerity cannot be disputed; but his opinion, as well as practice, ought to be condemned. He was to blame for believing that Christ was an impostor and his religion a delusion; for he was not an impostor, but gave infallible evidence of the divinity of his person and of his doctrines. That evidence Paul ought to have believed, and embraced Christ as the Saviour of the world, and united with his followers in promoting his cause. He was, therefore, wholly to blame for his erroneous sentiments. They were owing to an evil heart of unbelief. He hated the doctrines which Christ taught, because they condemned his religious sentiments and destroyed his religious hopes. He wished to believe, that such doctrines were not true, and of course, wished to believe, that he who taught them was an impostor. And he formed his opinion according to his heart, which blinded his understanding. All religious errors flow from the same source from which Paul's flowed. They are the effect of a corrupt heart, and are as corrupt as the heart from which they flow. Men are, therefore, as much to blame for their erroneous opinions which flow from their depraved hearts, as for any of their sinful actions, which flow from their depraved hearts. It seems to be a very prevailing opinion, that men are not to blame for any religious errors they imbibe, because the heart is not concerned in believing or disbelieving any religious doctrines. But this is a great mistake, for men's hearts have as much influence in forming their opinions, as in governing their external actions. A sinful heart disposes men to believe what is false, as well as disposes them to do what is wrong. Under the Old Testament, the prophets reproved the people of God for imbibing the gross and fatal errors of the idolatrous nations round about them. Under the New Testament, Christ severely reproved and condemned the Scribes and Pharisees for their fatal errors, respecting the divine commands, and respecting his person and preaching. He expressly told them, "except ye *believe* that

I am he, ye shall die in your sins." And he warned men to beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees; by which he explained himself to mean, their false and dangerous doctrines. The Apostle also condemned false teachers, and warned men to guard against their corrupt and dangerous doctrines. "Now I beseech you, brethren," says he, "mark them which cause divisions and offences, contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them." And again he says, "A man that is an heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject; knowing that he that is such, is subverted, being condemned of himself." Professors of religion are as really criminal, and as really deserve to be censured and excommunicated for heresy, as for immorality.

2. It appears from the case of Paul, that there is a wide difference between men's merely thinking that their religious sentiments are right, and knowing them to be so. Paul verily thought that he was right when he formed, and while he maintained a false and groundless opinion of Christ. He sincerely believed, that he ought to view Christ as an impostor; that he ought to reject the Gospel which he preached; and that he ought to oppose and persecute those who embraced it. But his sentiments were grossly erroneous, which he had no right to believe and maintain. And after he embraced the Gospel, he not only *thought*, but *knew* that he believed the truth. He clearly saw the wide and essential difference between merely *thinking* he was right and *knowing* that he was so. All who cordially embrace religious error, always *think* they embrace the truth; but it is impossible that they should *know* that they embrace the truth, while they embrace error. Error is diametrically opposite to truth, and, therefore, merely thinking error to be the truth cannot make it so. This Paul was conscious of, after he had renounced the error which he had *thought* to be the *truth*, and embraced the *truth* which he had *thought* to be an error. He then *knew* that his having *thought* an error to be the truth, did not make it the truth; and though his sincerity in *thinking* his error to be the truth, extenuated his guilt, yet it did not entirely remove it; for he acknowledged that he obtained mercy, because he erred and acted *ignorantly* in unbelief. Men may *think* they are right, when they are wrong; but they *cannot know* they are right, when they are wrong. Some suppose, that no man can *know* that any one doctrine of the Gospel is true, and on this supposition, they conclude that no man can be to blame for not distinguishing between truth and error, or for embracing error instead of truth. But this supposition is contrary to Scripture and common sense. Men can *know* that some of the doctrines of the Gospel *are true*. Job says, "I know that my Redeemer liveth." Paul says, "I know whom I have believed." And the Apostle John says to Christians, "I have not written unto you because *ye know not* the truth: but because ye *know it*, and that no lie is of the truth." How often do men *think* they know that to be true, which afterwards they *know* was not true. Though those, who embrace the most gross and fatal errors in religion, may verily *think* that the errors they embrace are divine and important truths; yet they do not and can-

not *know* that they are so. There is no reason to doubt but that errorists, at this day, are as sincere in their erroneous sentiments as Paul was, while in the state of nature. He embraced error with his whole heart, and so do errorists at this day. Their understanding is darkened, being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them, because of the *blindness* of their hearts. Out of their hearts proceed *erroneous*, as well as all their other evil thoughts. If we only make the great and essential distinction between men's *merely thinking* they are right in their religious sentiments, and *their knowing* they are right, we may allow them all the *sincerity* that they profess to have; and yet condemn them for their *evil heart* of unbelief. With all their sincerity, they may be as bitter enemies to Christ and his cause as Paul was, and as ardently desire and endeavour to overthrow Christianity, as he did. Their plea of sincerity ought to have but little weight with themselves, or with others, for it will have but little weight with Christ, who will root up every plant, which his Father has not planted.

3. It appears from the case of Paul, that those, who embrace religious errors, may be extremely *zealous* to propagate them. It does appear strange at first view, that those who embrace false and fatal sentiments, should be very zealous to propagate their errors. They generally maintain, that it is of little importance what doctrines men embrace, if they are only sincere in their belief; and accordingly profess to exercise great charity and catholicism towards all who differ from them in their religious opinions. But the truth is, they are more zealous to maintain their false and fatal sentiments, than many others are to maintain and propagate the doctrines according to godliness. They are like Paul, whose whole heart was in his errors. His selfish heart kindled into zeal to oppose the truths, that contradicted his belief and destroyed his hopes; and to give up them was like giving up the ghost. His false hopes made him alive and happy; and he would sooner give up his life, than give up his future and eternal hopes. It is not strange, therefore, that he had a false and flaming zeal. There is precisely the same cause, why errorists, at this day, should be zealots. They build their hopes of eternal happiness upon their false schemes of religion, and see no other foundation upon which they, or, others can safely rest. Their profession of catholicism is a fiction, but their zeal is built upon what they consider a reality. It seems, however, a little more difficult to account for the zeal of Universalists. Their scheme promises safety to all, and requires them, if they are consistent, to extend their charity and catholicism to all; which seems to remove every motive to zeal, in maintaining and propagating their singular error. I call it singular, because it has been long broached, but could never gain many proselytes in any part of the Christian world. But, perhaps, it is principally owing to this very difficulty to make proselytes, that the advocates of this absurd doctrine feel such an ardent zeal to increase their number, and strengthen their hands and hopes. However, be this as it may, we know that they, like other heretics, feel and express a peculiar zeal, to maintain and spread their

soul-ruining errors, though it makes the whole Bible a dead letter, and takes off all restraints from the corruptions of the human heart. These corruptions, indeed, foster every false scheme of religion, and give the patrons of error all the advantage they ever gain over the friends of truth. The great majority of mankind love error, rather than truth, and the publishers of error, rather than the publishers of truth. Individuals are fond of following the multitude to believe falsehood, as well as to do evil. The hope of success, therefore, has a powerful influence to inflame the zeal of all sorts of errorists.

4. It appears from the case of Paul, that religious error has a tendency to do immense mischief in the world. Paul's religious error, respecting Christ and his cause, was a fruitful source of great and complicated evils, as long, and even longer than he continued to act under the baleful influence of it. Though Christ did not suffer him to continue long in his blind and false zeal, yet in a few months, he did incalculable mischief. In the space of less than one year, he spread terror, distress, and misery in the church of Christ, by persecuting many, and destroying some of his most faithful and eminent followers. Such fatal effects of his error and blind zeal he freely acknowledges and bitterly laments. "I verily thought with myself, that I ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth. Which things I also did in Jerusalem: and many of the saints did I shut up in prison, having received authority from the chief priests; and when they were put to death, I gave my voice against them. And I punished them oft in every synagogue, and compelled them to blaspheme; and being exceedingly mad against them, I persecuted them even unto strange cities." Thus he made havoc of the church, putting some to death, causing some to blaspheme, subjecting some to the sufferings of cruel confinement, and scattering others into strange cities. These were great natural evils to the injured and persecuted, flowing from his bitter and baleful zeal. But these were minor evils in comparison with the great and extensive *moral* evils they produced. In all probability, they deterred and prevented thousands and thousands from embracing and professing the Gospel, and securing the salvation of their souls, at that time and afterwards. Religious error always tends to excite a blind and false zeal, and a blind and false zeal always tends to promote persecution. It *actually* produced ten persecutions of the church in the three first centuries after Christianity was published. And it produced the same dire effects afterwards at different times and in different parts of the world. And it is still the natural tendency of religious error to produce a blind, bitter, and persecuting zeal. Though many imagined, that errorists have lost not only their *power*, but their *zeal* to persecute; yet I see nothing in the state of the world, nor in the temper of the times, to render it impossible, or even improbable, that the power and spirit of persecution should again revive, and produce their natural and destructive effects. We now know, that religious error and false zeal are doing great *moral* mischief in every part of our country; and

without the spirit of prophecy it is easy to foresee, that a flood of errors will overwhelm our churches, unless the friends and Spirit of God set up a standard against them.

5. The case of Paul shows us, that the grossest and most inveterate errors are not incurable. They may be removed where they have the strongest hold of the human mind. Paul was a man of learning and of superior reasoning powers, which he had vigorously exercised in confirming his religious errors, which he had imbibed, increased, and strengthened from his youth. His erroneous sentiments in respect to the law, prepared the way for his erroneous sentiments in respect to Christ and the Gospel. He was sincere, and, therefore, secure in his errors. When he set out for Damascus, he felt beyond the reach of conviction, but he was suddenly and effectually stopped in his mad career in error and zeal. These were founded in his corrupt heart, and this foundation Christ was able to take away, and when he had taken it away, his errors like a dream vanished in a moment. When a blind heart was taken away, and a wise and understanding heart was given him, he immediately saw and renounced his errors, and joyfully embraced the truth of the Gospel. Paul always has admired, and always will admire the sovereign grace of Christ in producing this great change in his sentiments, and setting him up as a striking instance of a converted errorist. His case clearly shows that men may be, and how they may be, effectually cured of the grossest and most inveterate errors. All corrupt sentiments in religion are founded in a corrupt heart; and this foundation God can take away whenever he pleases. Though those, who have imbibed great and fatal errors, appear to be in the most dangerous state, yet there is hope in their case. They are in the hand of a sovereign God, who has been graciously pleased to convert some skeptics, some deists, some Unitarians, and some Universalists Where God has arisen and powerfully pleaded his own cause, he has often made the arrows of conviction pierce the understandings, the consciences, and the hearts of errorists, and laid them, like Paul, prostrate at the feet of divine sovereignty. The teachers and professors of religion have encouragement to employ all the means and opportunities they enjoy, to enlighten, reform, and restrain those, who are walking in the blind and dangerous paths of error, if "God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth."

6. The case of Paul shows, that when sinners are under genuine convictions, they condemn themselves for all their past errors in opinion and practice. Before his conversion, Paul viewed himself as one of the best of men. He verily thought he was sincere in faith and in practice. As touching the law he felt himself entirely blameless. He thought that he had lived in all good conscience towards God and man. He felt confident that he stood high in the divine favor. He was once alive in hope without the law. But when he was struck under genuine convictions, his sins revived and his hopes died. He saw that he had always lived under the power and dominion of a totally *selfish heart*, which render-

ed all his religious opinions, and religious services, and supposed obedience, altogether sinful in the sight of a holy and heart searching God. He judged and condemned himself for all in his heart and life, of which he had vainly and confidently boasted. He felt himself to be a lost and ruined creature, and had no other plea to make but that of the publican, "God be merciful to me a sinner." This representation is perfectly agreeable to the account that Paul gives of himself under genuine convictions. "If any man thinketh that he hath whereof he might trust in the flesh, I more: circumcised the eighth day, of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, an Hebrew of the Hebrews; as touching the law, a Pharisee; concerning zeal, persecuting the church; touching the righteousness which is in the law, blameless. But what things were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ." Thus he condemned himself for what he once supposed to be sincere in his faith and sincere in his practice, being fully convinced that his whole life had been filled up with disaffection and disobedience to God, for which he deserved to perish forever. When any sinners are struck under genuine convictions, they condemn themselves for all their past errors in opinion and practice. They see that they have been governed by selfish motives in all their views and feelings and conduct, by which they have constantly transgressed the law of love and displeased God, which throws them into the gall of bitterness and into self-condemnation. This is true of all sinners under genuine convictions, whether they have been Orthodox or heterodox in principle, or moral or immoral in conduct. When Paul was convinced and converted, he *knew* that his former sentiments of Christ and the Gospel were *false*, and that his new views of Christ and of the Gospel were *true*. Such a change from error to truth, from selfishness to benevolence, every sinner must experience in order to be saved. Paul's convictions and conversion are a *pattern* to all who shall hereafter believe in Christ to everlasting life. The erroneous must renounce their errors, the self-righteous must renounce their self-righteousness, and the profligate must renounce their profligacy, in order to embrace the Gospel and obtain eternal life. There is but one straight and narrow path to heaven; and let no errorist, let no self-righteous moralist, let no profligate sinner, deceive and flatter himself, that he can go to heaven, while he walks *in* any other path. The *broad* road certainly leads to *destruction*.

7. It appears from the case of Paul, that while men are in the state of nature, they do nothing that is right, but all they do is wrong and displeasing to God. Paul verily thought he kept the whole law, did his whole duty, and was altogether blameless, while he was in the state of nature and totally destitute of true love to God; but he was under a great and awfully dangerous delusion, for his heart all the time was full of evil and fully set in him to do evil. While he verily thought he was doing his duty, in viewing and treating Christ as an impostor and in persecuting his followers, he was actually sinning with a high hand; and while he thought he was obeying the whole law, by paying a merely *external* respect to it, he was

actually breaking the whole law. When he did what his conscience told him was *right* he sinned, and when he did what his conscience told him was *wrong* he sinned; for he constantly acted from a totally selfish heart which was full of enmity to God. He could do nothing but sin, whether he obeyed or disobeyed his conscience from a corrupt heart. While his conscience told him he ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus, he would have sinned, if he had not opposed Christ. And while his conscience told him he ought to pay an *external* obedience to *all* the divine commands, he would have sinned, if he had not paid that external obedience. He was under a moral necessity of doing wrong. And this is precisely the case of all men in the state of nature. They possess a carnal mind which is enmity against God, not subject to his law, neither indeed can be. All their desires and prayers and external obedience are an abomination in the sight of God. Though they verily think, as Paul did, that they are serving God, yet they are really serving themselves, and sinning against God. This they must see and condemn as Paul did, or they can never find mercy. Such self-deception is extremely dangerous. It well nigh ruined Paul, and has actually ruined multitudes, who have enjoyed and abused the means of grace. Is there not great reason to fear, that there are many, who are without the law, flattering themselves that they are doing their duty, while they are constantly sinning against God, and rejecting the Gospel? Those are in a dangerous condition, who are under a strong delusion to believe gross and fatal errors; but are not others in a dangerous situation, who vainly imagine, they are doing their duty, while they are doing no duty at all, and are pursuing the path to heaven, while they are pursuing a devout path to destruction? Does not self-righteousness generally mark the character of sinners among us? Is there any thing more blinding, stupifying and hardening, than self-righteousness? Is not the present state of sinners extremely hazardous and alarming? Remember the commandment will come sooner or later, and when it does come, your sins will revive and your hopes will die. Immediately condemn your sincerity in error and sin, and fly from the wrath to come, and lay hold on eternal life.

From the Christian Spectator.

THE UNCOMPROMISING CHARACTER OF CHRISTIANITY.

During the persecutions under the early Roman emperors, the Christians were accused of inflexible obstinacy; of an uncompromising, unsociable temper in respect to their religion. Pliny, in his well known letter to Trajan, says of them; "I did not in the least hesitate, but that, whatever should appear on their confession, to be their faith; yet their frowardness and inflexible obstinacy, would certainly deserve punishment." A learned writer, in remarking on this passage asks;—"what was this inflexible obstinacy? It could not be the professing a new religion; that was common enough. It was the refusing all communion with paganism; refusing to throw a grain of incense on their altars. For we must not think," says he, "that this was enforced by the Roman

magistrates to make the Christians *renounce* their religion; but only to test its *hospitality* and *sociableness of temper*. When the Gospel was first promulgated, it was favourably heard. One of the Roman emperors introduced it among his closet religions. Another proposed to the senate to give it a more public entertainment: but when it was found to carry its pretensions higher, and to claim to be the *only true one*, then it was that it began to incur hatred and contempt: but when it went still further, and urged the necessity of all men forsaking their own national religions, and embracing the Gospel, this so shocked the pagans, that it soon brought upon itself the bloody storm which followed. This is the true origin of persecution for religion, not committed, but undergone by the Christian church."

Reformers of every age, have, by their contemporaries, and often by those who followed them, been accused of the same thing. It is possible, now, that religion *may* take such a hold of the mind, and its obligations come to be viewed in such a light, and in such relations, by its professors, that they must necessarily appear obstinate to those who are unacquainted with the new power under the control of which their minds have been brought. The precepts of religion may require a certain *specific conformation* of *character*, perfectly distinct from every character which can be formed in any other way. It may bring to view facts and prospects for the existence of which, there is, to the mind of the Christian, evidence as convincing as intuition; and to which there is an importance attached, that makes it appear absolute madness, not to give them a paramount regard. Among these facts there may be some of so affecting and endearing a nature that he shall not only be driven to this specific conformation of character, but he shall seek to attain it, as the object of his highest desire. Among these facts and prospects, there may be another class, too, which are adapted to afford him such an amount of consolation and hope, as shall, beyond measure, outweigh all the possible pains and inconveniences, to which his religion can subject him in this world; and lead him to say with Paul, in the language of the great *Christian paradox*; "*sorrowful, yet always rejoicing.*"

But not only *may* the Christian have this separateness of character, and inflexibly maintain it, but there is an obligation and a necessity laid upon him to do it. The Christian is sent into the world to exhibit a living exemplification of divine truth. If, then, the facts and precepts of the Gospel have any *definite meaning* and application; if the Gospel *does* enjoin any definite principles of action, any definite course of conduct to be pursued rather than any other; if the Gospel does fix any definite boundaries within which Christianity is circumscribed, and by which it is separated from every thing else;—then the Christian must, in his religion, in his feelings, and in his conduct, stand off separate and aloof from all other men. He must not pass these boundaries, and parley with the world, for his life's sake. It has indeed become fashionable to suppose that all that language which in old times described Christianity as *a strait and narrow way*, which called Christians a *little flock*, and spoke of the Christian course as a *warfare with the world*, —has now become obsolete; and that the language has gone into

desuetude because there are no such things to be expressed. The hedges which bounded this narrow way are broken down, and the traveller may wander to the right or left,—indulge this appetite, participate in this amusement, and conform to this custom, without impediment or danger. The *level world* is the *way*—decency of deportment, and an amiable temper are Christianity. Christianity, as a distinct thing, has mouldered away, just as we may suppose some towering rock, which anciently was steep and well defined and conspicuous, by the wear of time and the elements to have become disorganized, and to have settled down into a gentle sand hill, extending nobody knows precisely how far, and scarcely to be distinguished from the surrounding plain. This is the Gospel, as it now exists in men's apprehensions; but for aught that can be seen in the Gospel itself, it was designed to last out the world, and all the while to remain towering, and well defined, and conspicuous, as when it was first promulgated.

But it is asserted that the world has become *better*, and there is no need of keeping up this unsociable, uncompromising temper towards it. The human heart has become the natural soil of Christian principle and Christian feeling. Let us hear what a learned and shrewd historian of the last century said on this point. "If a man were called," says Gibbon, "to fix the period in the history of the world, during which the condition of the human race was most prosperous and happy, he would without hesitation, name that which elapsed from the death of Domitian to the accession of Commodus." Had Gibbon lived till this day, he would doubtless have said the same; and he doubtless might have said it with equal truth. And can it be, he would seem to ask, that Christianity is of so exclusive and uncompromising a character that its professors could have no sympathy, no communion, with the humane and magnanimous Trajan, and the amiable and literary Pliny? Or could they not relax some of their peculiarities, so as to meet on some common ground, and hold intercourse, and mingle kind feelings with the philosophical and virtuous Antonines? No; they would not throw one grain of incense on the altar of another god, than the God of heaven; nor execrate Jesus, nor worship the idol, nor the king, though confiscation, and torture, and death, stared them in the face. This, as we have seen before, was the very reason why the Romans persecuted them.

But, contrary to what Mr. Gibbon has said, I admit, that the world, or that part of it where Christianity exists, has grown better; but at the same time, I reject the conclusion drawn from this admitted fact. And I reject it because I suppose this *admitted* fact to be *really* a fact. From what cause, I ask, has the world grown better? What has been the process of this melioration? The original, the abiding cause has been, this inhospitable, this uncompromising religion. The mode of its operating has been, its presenting itself to one age of men and another in its true unmodified aspect; and the fact that at those periods, and in those places, where it has shown most of its inhospitable, uncompromising character, it has made the greatest progress, and produced its most signal effects in meliorating the condition of man, proves,

that this inhospitality and unsociableness of temper are essential in giving to it meliorating power. Look at facts. Never did the Gospel make more rapid progress, or produce more glorious results, than it did in the days of the apostles. But never was there a class of men, in attempting to arrive at a desired object, opposed by more serious embarrassments. Never, to all human view, were the parties so unequally matched,—the twelve apostles against the world. Never did concession and compromise seem so unavoidable. Yet they did not concede. Their object was not to be at one with the world, at any rate; but to be at one with them on the principles of the Gospel; and this object was not to be gained by giving up their own ground and going over to that of the world; but by an unyielding maintenance of their own ground, and drawing the world to them. Hence the apostles, when brought before the magistrates, and threatened and commanded not to speak any more in the name of Jesus, answer,—"Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto men more than unto God, judge ye. *We cannot but speak* the things which we have seen and heard." Instead of yielding compliance to these mandates, they went on preaching just as before. When persecuted in one city they fled to another. "I am ready," said Paul, "not only to be *bound*, but to *die* for the name of the Lord Jesus." "None of these things move me, neither count I my life dear unto me." This was the language of all the apostles. All their conduct corresponded to such declarations. Their path was straight and plain. If the stake, or the cross stood in it, they went forward till they came to it, and there laid down their life, to be clothed upon with immortality. Such also were the principles and the conduct of the generation which succeeded the apostles. They lived to *contend* for the faith, and falling victims to their zeal, they died in the struggle rather than violate their principles. Such too, were the principles and conduct of the Waldenses, who for six centuries lived to *contend for the faith;* and though literally hunted like wild beasts, through their narrow vallies and over mountains of snow, afflicted and tormented; yet feeling that they were set for the defence of the Gospel, they opposed a fore front to the corruptions of the Romish Church, until they were cut in pieces and utterly dissipated by the power of Louis XIV. Such is the fact respecting Luther and his compeers. How easy would it have been for him, by yielding, or forbearing to avow, a few of his peculiar religious tenets to have kept peace with the church, and to have partaken largely of her honors. Yet he openly proclaimed his abhorrence of the abominations of that church—he burnt the decretals of the pope, and set at defiance the power of Charles; and in doing so he earned for himself the character which the saints at Jerusalem gave of Barnabas and Paul; he hazarded his own life for the name of the Lord Jesus. Now it may seem strange to us, as it did to Gibbon in reference to the Christians in the days of the Antonines, that Luther need be so rigid;—and we may ask why he could not sympathize with the refined and magnificent family of the Medici whose court was the home, and whose treasures were the patrimony of every artist, and poet, and philo-

sopher? That man, it would seem, must be a most unreasonable bigot to his own opinions who should be disposed—and that religion must be most unrefined and tasteless which requires its devotee, to break off all communion with the pontiff and the court which all taste and all learning have conspired to praise, and to which the splendid honor has been awarded of reviving literature and the arts from the death which Vandalism had inflicted. But so it was,—Luther was so much a bigot. He loved literature indeed, but he loved religion more; and being directly at issue with the pope on the latter, the former, in his view, afforded but a slight ground for communion of feeling. He knew that he had views of religious truth different from those of the whole mass of European population;—views, which, in his mind, were infinitely important to himself and to them. He knew that if he was to change the belief and character of Christendom, he was not to accomplish it by concealment and compromise, but by avowing and defending his peculiarities.

Just the same is true of Knox, who by one unremitted effort, lasting his life out, sustained the falling cause of protestantism in Scotland, as Atlas is fabled to have sustained the heavens on his shoulders.—These men, with a few sturdy coadjutors whom they gathered around them, as we should lean against a weight descending an inclined plain, withstood the rush of nations ever prone to descend again into their long cherished and dearly loved superstitions. The mass of those who favored the protestant cause seem to have had too little understanding of the truths they espoused, or too little feeling of their importance, or too much fondness for their old opinions, to give any impulse to the work of reformation, or even to maintain their own ground. It was necessary, therefore, for these few, in the powerful workings of whose minds the reformation begun,—like the leaders of a cowardly army,—to impart of their own courage to the timid, of their own conviction to the doubting, and of their own ardour to the indifferent. Thus the opinions, the courage, and the zeal of one man was imparted to thousands, and these constituted the army of the reformers. Now was it not presumption in Luther, to think his opinions were more correct than those in which all Europe had for ages deliberately concurred? Was it not obstinacy in him to adhere to them when all Europe agreed in denouncing them? Was it not most unsocial and uncompromising in him to refuse all sympathy and all communion with those who would not adopt his opinions when they were condemned by all the learning and power of Europe? Yes; Luther and Knox have been called obstinate and uncompromising men. The whole body of the Puritans have been called most unlovely Christians. But suppose that the apostles and the reformers of the 16th century, and the Puritans, instead of being thus unsocial and obstinate, had made concessions and met and held communion with their adversaries on some common ground, what would have been the effect on the progress of religion? This is not a question that cannot be answered; for it has been answered by facts a thousand times. When the church and the world met on common ground in the days of Constantine, the curse of God

came upon the church. It was given up to strong delusions. All its efforts were palsied; and it went back to downright paganism;—a paganism which broods over more than half of Europe to this day. When the English church attempted to make a similar compromise, did not a deep slumber come on it, and rest upon it, almost unbroken from the days of Elizabeth, till Wesley and Whitfield arose to disturb it? Other instances might be mentioned. Where are the results of the Catholic missions in Abyssinia, in Hindostan, in China, in Japan? These were all a system of compromise, and they are now as though they had never been.

We all know from our own observation that instances of individual compromise in matters of religion are always attended with inactivity and ill success;—and we all know too, from the nature of the case, that compromise cannot effect reformation. In Luther's time the current of the human mind set towards error, and superstition, and profligacy. Who ever thought of stemming a current, by allowing himself to float down on its surface? Who ever thought of reaching a goal by travelling away from it? In order to reclaim men from their errors, the reformer must exhibit in himself what he would have them be. He must, therefore, have a marked and obvious peculiarity;—not only so; but, if he intends to make them feel that he is in earnest, and sympathize with him, he must *obstinately* maintain this peculiarity, and thus show that he attaches an importance to it,—an importance that forbids him to yield it, though ridicule, and calumny, and death, be the consequence. Now this is precisely the way in which every reformer, ancient or modern, has advanced in his work. It is this obstinate and perilous maintenance of this peculiarity, which has given rise to the fact, that historians have narrated when they have quaintly said,—"The blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church:" a saying that is full of truth; and though to most it may seem perfectly paradoxical, yet it admits of a perfectly easy and philosophical explanation. Such men the church has had; and to such men as instruments, under the Head of the church, the church owes all her extent and all her glory: and we may add too, that such men are the only true ambassadors of Christ,—for they only take his religion as he gave it to them, and publish and defend it. We may further add, that such men ought least of all, to be called arrogant: for which is the greater arrogance in an ambassador,—to take his instructions as he finds them, and *faithfully* adhere to them, or to use with his instructions all that modification, and concealment, and compromise to which his own fancy, or the humor of those to whom he is sent, shall direct him?

The same demand is made now for a "*sociable, compromising*" religion, which was made in the times of primitive Christianity; and a wonder seems to be excited at the present day, why Christians cannot sympathize with the philosophical, the learned, and the amiable, similar to the wonder of former times, that Christians could not sympathize with the Antonines, or Luther with the Medici. But not only do men of this age make this demand for a "*sociable, compromising*" religion, but at the very time they make it they are so grossly

inconsistent as to praise the primitive Christians, the reformers, and the puritans. In looking back over the intervening generations, and tracing our best institutions to their origin, they see, that to these sturdy religionists we owe all our best notions of liberty, and nearly all our advancements in literature and science, and while enjoying all the advantages thus procured, they forget that rigid and uncompromising character which these religionists inflexibly maintained,—a peculiarity of character which alone gave them all their power to accomplish what they did accomplish, and by which alone they differed from other men, and for which alone they deserve peculiar praise. These asperities are all lost sight of in the distance, while the blessings which flow from them are all around us. These were men who lived, and labored, and suffered for succeeding generations; and we are those who have entered into, and are most indolently, and most ungratefully enjoying, their labors. But were I addressing the flexible, accommodating Christians of the present day, I would ask, what propriety is there in *your* eulogizing the *primitive Christians* and the *puritans?* What *community of feeling* have you with them? Do you possess that separateness of character, and that distinctiveness of class which they possessed? Is the line which divides *you* from the world, as straightly drawn and as plainly marked, as that which divides *them* from the world, so that in opposing the tide of error and vice, you and the world seem like the fore front of two contending armies? Are you as willing as they were to suffer ridicule, and reproach, and death, rather than give up a particle of your religion? Just put one of the *temporizing*, flexible Christians of the present day, by the side of one of the *round heads* of Cromwell's time, or one of the town council of Edinburgh in the days of the Scottish queen, and see how they would appear together—how their characters would compare. One would come boldly up to the line of gospel truth, and bow and shake hands across it, and upon invitation, would step over and travel on until he forgot whether he was a disciple of deism or of revelation. The other would approach that line with caution; and when he had reached it, he would plant his feet there, and though you should put terror behind to drive him,—or pleasure before to allure him,—yet would he laugh contempt on all your terrors, and frown on all your blandishments, standing straight and immoveable. You might saw him asunder, or burn him to ashes; but you must do it within the precincts of his own principles. Now how much resemblance is there between such characters; and what ground is there for them to eulogize each other? There is a perfect contrast between them;—to name them both in the same discourse, would be like sending Paul and the author of Don Juan to evangelize Corinth together; or like binding "the Saint's Rest," in the same volume with "the Age of Reason;" or like contemplating at the same time, a character which embodies all the moral sublime, and one that embodies whatever is drivelling and time-serving.

For the Christian Magazine.

MR. BALFOUR'S OPINION OF THE DEVIL, CARRIED OUT.

Messrs. Editors,

HAVING in my last communication, attended to the reading of the Scriptures according to Mr. Balfour's translation, in various instances, where the term Satan is applied to a real being in the Old Testament; I shall now review several passages in the New Testament, and see how they stand according to his interpretation. I shall not, at this time, however, follow Mr. B. in all those passages where the terms, Devil and Satan, are used *figuratively;* for I take it for granted, that no term can ever be used *figuratively*, unless it is sometimes used *literally*. A *literal* signification must necessarily be antecedent to the *figurative* use of any term whatever. Now that Mr. B. admits the figurative use of the terms, Satan and Devil, is evident; because he uses those terms himself in very different senses. Even *on his own ground*, therefore, these terms *may* and *must*, in certain instances, have a *literal* signification. Mr. B. has not told us, however, what that literal signification is; and, consequently, he has not, as yet, taken one step to prove, that there is not a real being, called, by Christians and the inspired writers, "the Devil and Satan."

The first passage in the New Testament, to which I shall apply Mr. B.'s translation, is, Luke, xxii. 31, 32. "And the Lord said, Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat: But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not: and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren." Here Mr. B. says the Jews were the Satan alluded to by our Lord. His words are these: (p. 100,) "In Psalm cix. and other places in Sec. 3, we have seen that the unbelieving Jews were called a Satan or adversary to our Lord. Here they showed themselves so by sifting Peter as wheat, for their opposition was chiefly against the Saviour." To have the true sense of the passage, then, we must read it in the following manner: 'And the Lord said, Simon, Simon, behold, "*the unbelieving Jews*" HATH desired to have you, that *he* may sift you as wheat: but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not: and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren.'

Luke, xiii. 16. "And ought not this woman, being a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan hath bound, lo, these eighteen years, be loosed from this bond on the sabbath day?" In this passage, Mr. B. makes the cause and the effect, or the agent and the action, one and the same *thing*. He makes "the spirit of infirmity" not only the Satan who bound the woman, but the bond with which she was bound. Accordingly Satan must have bound this woman *with himself*, for eighteen years. Now as the Satan who bound her, and the infirmity with which she was bound, were one and the same; the passage may read thus: 'Ought not this woman, being a daughter of Abraham, whom "*the spirit of infirmity*" hath bound with "*the spirit of infirmity*," lo, these eighteen years, be loosed from this "*spirit of infirmity*" on the sabbath day?' Again, Mr. B. says, p. 103, "this complaint medical men have called '*the rigidity of the back-bone.*'" "The rigidity of the back-bone," therefore, according to Mr. B. was the Satan who

bound the woman, and the Satan with which she was bound. The passage then may read thus: 'Ought not this woman, being a daughter of Abraham, whom "*the rigidity of the back-bone*" hath bound, lo, these eighteen years, be loosed from this "*rigidity of the back-bone*" on the sabbath day?'

Luke xxii. 3. "Then entered Satan into Judas, surnamed Iscariot, being of the number of the twelve." On this passage Mr. B. says, p. 105, "Well, what Satan entered into Judas? I answer, *the spirit of opposition to Jesus and the secret purpose to betray him.*" In order to get the true sense of the verse, therefore, we must read it in this manner: 'Then entered "*the spirit of opposition to Jesus and the secret purpose to betray him*" into Judas, surnamed Iscariot, being of the number of the twelve.'

John, xiii. 27. "And after the sop Satan entered into him." Here Mr. B. says, "What Satan now entered into Judas, for it is said in the preceding passage, that Satan had entered into him? I answer, his *fixed determination immediately to execute his purpose.* This purpose is called Satan entering into him, Luke, xxii. 1—7: and the Devil putting it into his heart, John, xiii. 2." We may, therefore, read these several passages in the following manner: John, xiii..27. 'And after the sop "*his fixed determination to execute his purpose*" entered into him.' John, xiii. 2. 'And supper being ended, "*his secret purpose to betray him*" having now put it into the heart of Judas Iscariot, Simon's son, to betray him.' Luke, xxii. 3. 'Then entered "*his secret determination to execute his purpose*" into Judas, surnamed Iscariot, being of the number of the twelve.' It seems, then, according to Mr. B.'s metaphysicks, that the secret purpose of Judas to betray Christ put it into his heart to betray him; and that "his *fixed determination immediately to execute his purpose*" entered into him, and instigated him immediately to carry his determination to execute his purpose into execution. This appears evident, because Mr. B. within one page, and in commenting upon this same passage, uses "*determination*" instead of "purpose," and makes it mean the same thing. For he says, speaking of what Christ communicated to his disciples, concerning the traitor, p. 106,—"The delicate hints of his guilt must have agitated Judas' mind: but giving him the sop must have roused him to fury, as he was now openly exposed, and he departs to execute his design. The words which followed confirm this—"that thou doest do quickly." These words, though not understood by the rest of the disciples, appear to have been well understood by Judas. They hastened his departure; for upon hearing them he went "immediately out." But where did he go to, and for what purpose? To his employers, the chief priests, that he might execute his determination." Mr. B. then certainly interchanges the words, *purpose*, *design*, and *determination*, and makes them all mean the same thing. It seems that the "*determination*" of Judas enters into him to execute his "*purpose*;" and his "*purpose*" puts it into his heart to execute his "*design*;" and both his "*purpose*" and "*design*" instigate him to execute his "*determination.*" This must certainly either be a "*tri*-devil," or else one devil enters into Judas to execute ano-

ther devil. In either case, we think it surpasses even Ezekiel's vision of "*a wheel within a wheel*," and outdoes every "christian devil," and every "orthodox devil," of which we ever heard or read.

Acts, v. iii. "But Peter said, Ananias, why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie unto the Holy Ghost, and to keep back part of the price of the land?" On this passage, Mr. B. says, p. 107, "what is meant by Satan *filling* the heart, is explained to mean, Ananias *conceiving this thing in his heart.*" Also, p. 108, "Ananias and his wife were drawn away by their lust or love of money. This Satan filled their heart." It seems, therefore, according to Mr. B. that Peter should have said, 'Ananias, why hath "*lust or the love of money*" filled thine heart to lie unto the Holy Ghost, and to keep back part of the price of the land?' Here we enjoy the light of Mr. B.'s metaphysicks again. Satan filling the heart of Ananias, means, Ananias "*conceiving this thing in his heart*," and this Satan which filled his heart, is "*lust or the love of money.*" This must be "a wheel within a wheel;" but which wheel is within the other, whether "*conceiving this thing in his heart*," or "*the love of money*," Mr. B. does not condescend to tell us. It is very desirable, that, if Mr. B.'s "*design*," "*purpose*," "*determination*," "LOVE OF MONEY," "*desire*," "*lust*," "*serpent*," or "SATAN," should instigate him to write again, he will tell us what these things mean.

Acts, xxvi. 18. "To open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me." Here Mr. B. after several comments, says, p. 109, "The darkness of ignorance, superstition, and wickedness, were the Satan from which Paul turned men, and this he did by the light of the glorious gospel of Christ." There can be no doubt, therefore, according to Mr. B. that the passage should read in the following manner: 'To open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of "*darkness of ignorance, superstition, and wickedness*," unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me.'

Romans, xvi. 20. "And the God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly." Here Mr. B. says, p. 109, "The term Satan is frequently used to designate the persecuting Jews, and this declaration of the apostle is agreeable to the fact, for they were bruised under the feet of Christians in the destruction of their city and temple, and dispersion among all nations as our Lord predicted, Matt. xxiv." It seems then, that Paul ought to have said, 'And the God of peace shall bruise "*the persecuting Jews*" under your feet shortly.'

1 Cor. v. 5. "To deliver such an one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus." On this passage Mr. B. comes to the conclusion, p. 111, that the term Satan means, "the adversaries of the Gospel." It seems, therefore, that Paul expressed himself ambiguously, and ought to have been more explicit. Indeed, how much is it to be regretted, that the Corinthian church did not have a Mr. Balfour to interpret

for them! The passage under consideration, according to Mr. B. should read thus: 'To deliver such an one unto "*the adversaries of the gospel*," for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.'

1 Tim. i. 20. "Of whom is Hymeneus and Alexander; whom I have delivered unto Satan, that they may learn not to blaspheme." Mr. B. says, "the remarks on the last text are sufficient here." The passage, therefore, should read in this manner: 'Of whom is Hymeneus and Alexander; whom I have delivered unto "*the adversaries of the gospel*," that they may learn not to blaspheme.'

1 Cor. vii. 5. "Defraud ye not one the other, except it be with consent for a time, that ye may give yourselves to fasting and prayer; and come together again, that Satan tempt you not for your incontinency." On this passage also, Mr. B. concludes, p. 111, that Satan may mean "the adversaries of the gospel," and perhaps "lust or sinful desire." The passage then ought to stand thus: 'Defraud ye not one the other, except it be with consent for a time, that ye may give yourselves to fasting and prayer; and come together again, that "*the adversaries of the gospel*," or "*lust or sinful desire*," tempt you not for your incontinency.'

2 Cor. ii. 11. "Lest Satan should get an advantage of us: for we are not ignorant of his devices." On this text Mr. B. refers us to his exposition of 1 Cor. v. 5, where he says, Satan means "the adversaries of the Gospel." To obtain Paul's meaning, then, we must read, 'Lest "the adversaries of the Gospel" should get an advantage of us: for we are not ignorant of *his* devices.' But Mr. B. says, "I may just add, that the Scripture usage of the term Satan, would warrant us to say, that an unforgiving temper of mind was the Satan here referred to." The passage, with this interpretation, may read thus: 'Lest "*an unforgiving temper of mind*" should get an advantage of us: for we are not ignorant of *his* devices.'

2 Cor. xi. 14. "And no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light." On this passage, pp. 112, 113, Mr. B. endeavors to prove, as in other places, that Satan means "the unbelieving and persecuting Jews." In order to get the true *sense* of the Apostle, then, we must read this and the following passage thus: 'And no marvel; for "*the unbelieving and persecuting Jews*" himself is transformed into an angel of light. Therefore it is no great thing if *his* ministers also be transformed as the ministers of righteousness; whose end shall be according to their works.' Mr. B. also says, that the term Satan means, "the unbelieving and persecuting Jews," in the following passages, which I shall cite severally, according to the common version, and read according to his translation. 2 Cor. xii. 7. "And lest I should be exalted above measure through the abundance of the revelations, there was given to me a thorn in the flesh, the messenger of Satan to buffet me, lest I should be exalted above measure." Mr. B. 'And lest I should be exalted above measure through the abundance of the revelations, there was given to me a thorn in the flesh, the messenger of "*the unbelieving and persecuting Jews*" to buffet me, lest I should be exalted above measure.' 1 Thes. ii. 18. "Wherefore we would have

come to you, even I Paul, once and again; but Satan hindered us." Mr. B. 'Wherefore we would have come to you, even I Paul, once and again; but "*the unbelieving and persecuting Jews*" hindered us.' 2 Thes. ii. 9. "Even him whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power and signs, and lying wonders." Mr. B. 'Even him whose coming is after the working of "*the unbelieving and persecuting Jews*," with all power and signs, and lying wonders.' 1 Tim. v. 15. "For some are already turned aside after Satan." Mr. B. 'For some are already turned aside after "*the unbelieving and persecuting Jews.*"'

Rev. ii. 9. "I know thy works, and tribulation, and poverty, (but thou art rich,) and I know the blasphemy of them who say they are Jews, and are not, but are the synagogue of Satan." On this passage Mr. B. remarks, p. 115, "The persons spoken of, *said they were Jews*, but *were not.* They were of the synagogue of Satan, or adversary; or they belonged to the synagogue of the unbelieving, persecuting Jews." Mr. B. therefore, has, at once, let us into the true meaning of the passage. "I know thy works, and tribulation, and poverty, (but thou art rich,) and I know the blasphemy of them who say they are Jews, and are not, but are the synagogue of "the unbelieving, persecuting Jews." He also makes the term, Satan, mean the same persons, in the following passage. Rev. iii. 9. "Behold, I will make them of the synagogue of Satan, which say they are Jews and are not, but do lie; behold, I will make them to come and worship before thy feet, and to know that I have loved thee." Mr. B. 'Behold, I will make them of the synagogue of "*the unbelieving, persecuting Jews,*" which say they are Jews and are not, but do lie; behold, I will make them to come and worship before thy feet, and to know that I have loved thee.'

Rev. ii. 13. "I know thy works, and where thou dwellest, even where Satan's seat is: and thou holdest fast my name, and hast not denied my faith, even in those days wherein Antipas was my faithful martyr, who was slain among you, where Satan dwelleth." Here Mr. B. remarks, "If Satan is only rendered adversary, all difficulty is at once removed." So Mr. B. will give us the true sense, by reading it thus: 'I know thy works, and where thou dwellest, even where "*adversary's*" seat is: and thou holdest fast my name, and hast not denied my faith, even in those days wherein Antipas was my faithful martyr, who was slain among you, where "adversary" dwelleth.' So also in Rev. ii. 24. "But unto you I say, and unto the rest in Thyatira, As many as have not this doctrine, and which have not known the depths of Satan, as they speak; I will put upon you none other burden." Mr. B. 'But unto you I say, and unto the rest in Thyatira, as many as have not this doctrine, and which have not known the depths of "*adversary,*" as they speak; I will put upon you none other burden.'

How much to be lamented, that Mr. B. did not live in the days of King James I. of England. MATHETES.

From the Western Intelligencer.

THE STRAIGHT ROAD.

President N—— once preached a discourse near Schenectady, in

which he set forth the intense and eternal torments of the finally impenitent. One of our modern restorationists heard the discourse; and, having "an itching palm" to show his knowledge of futurity and divine dispositions, he followed the President to the house, where he took tea after the exercises of the day were closed, and introduced himself, by saying to Mr. N——, "Well, Sir, I have been to hear you preach, and have come here to request you to prove your doctrine." "I thought I had proved it; for I took the Bible for testimony," was the reply. "Well, I do not find any thing in *my* Bible to prove that the sinner is *eternally damned*, and I do not believe any such thing." "What do you believe?" "Why, I believe that mankind will be judged according to the deeds done in the body, and those that deserve punishment, will be sent to hell, and remain there until the debt is paid," &c. Says Mr. N——, "I have but a word to say to you; and first—for what did Christ die? And lastly—there is a straight road to Heaven; but if you are determined to go round through Hell, to get there, I cannot help it." The man took his leave, but his mind was "ill at ease." *There is a straight road to Heaven*, still rang in his ears: he went home, read his Bible attentively, and was soon convinced of and acknowledged his error; and after a suitable time, united with the followers of the Lamb.

SLANDER.

A person who can live in this world without suffering slander, must be too stupid or insignificant to claim attention.

BUSY BODIES.

"*And withal they learn to be idle, wandering about from house to house; and not only idle but tattlers also, and busy bodies, speaking things which they ought not.*"

A VERY favorable argument for the divine authenticity of the sacred scriptures, is to be derived from their perfect exhibition of the human character. They delineate it in all the variations of its formation, as it is influenced by prosperity and adversity, by virtue and by vice, with an accuracy so complete, that the most ordinary proficient in the knowledge of human nature and of the Bible must be convinced that nothing but the inspiration of the Almighty could have originated such a correct representation. The passage which is placed at the head of this article, tells us of those who are *idlers*, *wanderers*, *tattlers*, *speaking things they ought not.* The light of almost every day furnishes illustrations of this divine declaration. They are to be found not only among the poorer and inferior grades of society; but they can be numbered where affluence, where intelligence, and where honor resides. These habits of idleness and of defamation are having too much influence in society.—They are engendering evils which tend to undermine the felicity of individuals, and the peace and good order of communities. It is time now, when so much is doing to exterminate vice as it is fostered by the intemperate, the profane, and the sabbath breaker, that SOMETHING should be done to destroy the contagion which these practices are emitting into our moral atmosphere. I cannot believe that there is a consciousness in many who accustom themselves to these practices, of their deteri-

orating and pestiferous influence. —A moment's attention, however, must give their true tendency.

"*And withal they learn to be idle, wandering about from house to house.*" Idleness, then, first presents itself for notice. Now in a community like ours, made resplendent as it is by religion and literature, a vagrant, idle, wandering individual, whose very appearance, the tatters of whose attire, the expressions of whose visage, and the sluggishness of whose actions, at once conveys to the beholder his character, and fills him with feelings indignant at the thought that this wretched miscreant is bound to him by the common ties of humanity. But why should our feelings of indignation be less highly graduated when the idler comes before us in the garb of respectability? There are reasons then which should not in the least permit them to wane. The comeliness of his dress and the gentility of his appearance should create in us the reflection of the time he is wasting, which might be consumed in purposes beneficial to mankind. The splendor of attire ought never to be the panoply to shield vice from punishment. This man is an idler; he is not at his occupation. Neither friendship, nor business, nor civility requires him about you with the frequency his visits are repeated. He lounges around you at your dwellings; he comes near you in your places of business; and he haunts the hours of your retirement.—And still the ensigns of civility are held out to him. A character like this, consuming the precious moments of his existence in "wandering about from house to house," ought not to be the recipient either of urbanity or regard.

These characters are "not only idle" "*but tattlers also, and busy bodies, speaking things which they ought not.*" Business may plead for frequent intercourse with our neighbors, and then we speak things which we ought. But when this intercourse is supported neither by business nor by friendship, then are we entitled to make the inference that things are spoken which ought not to be. Then we are upheld in supposing that the theme of conversation is not what interests the votary of religion; not what charms the lover of science; not what excites the glow of patriotism, nor what gives the political aspirant new zest for clambering the rugged ascent to honor.—No: Such themes as these interest not these "busy bodies." Persons, characters, must be their subjects. The business of neighbors must be canvassed. Their plans must be scrutinized, and if in their ingenuity they are not exceeded, must be misrepresented and perverted. The conversation which these "busy bodies" hear in one family must be made to savour of personal reprehension when retailed in the next, and thus be made the seeds whose fruits are perpetual hostilities to harass the peace of those who always "had taken sweet counsel together and walked to the house of God in company." When these "busy bodies" see *persons* who from their acts, their measures, and their *ordinary demeanor*, they imagine, design to obtain an honorable rank in the community, they must assail their characters with all that asperity of language and virulence of invective in their power to command.—For the truth of these remarks let the existing state of things, as almost every town will exhibit, speak. Cannot

the reader call to his "mind's eye" characters who are here correctly pourtrayed? Can he not call up before him many who have "*withal learnt to be idle, wandering about from house to house; and not only idle but tattlers also, and busy bodies, speaking things which they ought not,*" creating their tales of slander, and zealously publishing them to the world?—Now, I seriously ask, what is the incentive to the actions of these 'busy bodies'? Is it to effect the reformation of those upon whom they shower their calumny? It cannot be; for its victims are generally of superior merit to those by whom they are offered a sacrifice. It can be nought but that passion which prompted the adversary of souls to enter the garden of paradise, and there to disturb the quiet of our first progenitors.

In view of these things, ought not something to be done? Ought domestic tranquillity longer to be invaded by these 'busy bodies,' "who go about like a roaring lion, seeking whom they may devour," when the evil can be so easily remedied? Yes: we trust there can something be done. Let them who thus make shipwreck of character, who thus love to despoil merit of its loveliness and virtue of its attractions, however elevated they are by their wealth or their intelligence, be made to wear the badge of the 'CALUMNIATOR,' at which society may look and avoid them.—Could this be done, and what is more easy? character would not long be blackened by slander.—Innocence would not long be enrobed in the habiliments of guilt. If society would manifest their opinion of these 'busy bodies' by such overt expressions as could not be hid from them, their number would rapidly diminish. The want of this manifestation is the only bar to their reformation. Let individuals come out and boldly express their scorn, when they behold the calumniator busy at his work of defamation. Let the press, which has too long been silent, send forth its influence; let the sacred functionary of the pulpit more frequently "cry aloud and spare not" those who belong to the community of 'busy bodies.' Let these things be done, and the work of reformation is begun.

VERITAS.

Review.

REVIEW OF TRACTS *published by the American Unitarian Association.*

[Continued from page 252.]

THE ninth Tract in the series is entitled "Causes of the Progress of Liberal Christianity in New-England." It is *assumed* by the writer, that the Unitarians of New-England have widely departed from the religious system of the early settlers of this country. "Never," says he, "has there been a *change greater* or *more remarkable.*" (p. 3.) It is farther *assumed*, that this change consists in a series of improvements—a great increase of light and knowledge which entitle it to be regarded as a *reformation.* And still farther it is *assumed*, that this reformation has advanced more rapidly and gloriously in New-England, than in any other part of the Christian world. For this last fact, three specific reasons are assigned: First, "the character of our puritan ancestors;" second, "the popular cast of our religious institutions;" and

third, "the interest taken by intelligent laymen in theological discussions."

The *first* assumption of this writer we admit—in as strong terms as he has expressed it. Unitarians have departed widely indeed from the religious system of their "puritan ancestors;" and the changes they have effected in some places are as remarkable as they are great. It is remarkable that they should be able to introduce an entirely new order of things—another Saviour, and another Gospel—into some of the largest and wealthiest congregations in the land, and to do it with so much secrecy and art, that no great commotions should be excited, and no livings forfeited—that few should be disquieted, or alarmed, or suspect indeed that any change was going on, until the whole was accomplished, and they were prepared to acquiesce in it.

The *second* assumption we of course deny; and hope to make it appear, before we are through, that this denial is not without reason.

Respecting the *third*, we are still in doubt, the confidence expressed by the writer of the Tract, notwithstanding. We have yet to learn, that the progress of Unitarianism in this country, during the last thirty or forty years, has been more rapid than it has been in other countries, and at other periods—more rapid than it was in the East, in the days of Arius; or than it was in Poland, in the days of the younger Socinus; or than it has been more recently in some parts of Europe. But this is a point of very little consequence.

The great questions to be decided are these; whether Unitarianism is indeed an *improvement* upon the religious system of our Puritan ancestors; and whether its introduction and progress in New-England have been effected by the operation of *causes* such as the writer of the Tract assigns.

Unitarians often speak of themselves as *reformers*, and seem to think that they are very piously engaged in carrying forward the reformation from Popery. Luther, and those who followed him, did what they could; but they were very far from accomplishing the work which they commenced. They were enabled to break away from the spiritual tyranny of Rome, and to expose and abolish some of the Popish errors and abuses in point of order and discipline; but it was left for Unitarians of the nineteenth century to finish the work of reformation, by exposing and extirpating the remaining errors and delusions of Popery, particularly in regard to doctrines.*

In considering this subject, it will be needful to ascertain as definitely as possible, in what this new reformation from Popery consists, and to what lengths it has been already carried. By this means, our readers will be able to judge for themselves whether it is more properly a reformation, or a relapse—a high advance in religious knowledge, or a reverting back to the exploded heresies of other times.

These self-styled reformers begin with rejecting *the plenary inspiration of the Holy Scriptures.*† They next discard the doctrine of the *Trinity*, regarding the Son (to use their own language) as "infinitely inferior" to the Fa-

* See Christian Examiner, Vol. iii. p. 76.

† See Christian Register, Nov. 4, 1826. Also, "Improved Version of New Testament," and "Le Clerc on Inspiration," both of which have been published, with high encomiums, by Unitarians of New England.

ther, and denying that there is, in the sense commonly received, any Holy Ghost.* They deny the original *apostacy* of man. "It is not," we are told, "the way of heaven with our race, to begin with that which is perfect, and let decline and corruption succeed."† They deny the doctrine of *total depravity*, insisting that "wickedness, so far from being the prevailing part of human character, makes but an *inconsiderable part* of it."‡ They describe *regeneration* as "a change, either from the Jewish religion, or the idolatrous religion of the Gentiles, to the open profession and sincere belief of the Christian religion;" but that the term "is without meaning," when applied to those who have been born and educated under the Gospel.§ As to the *atonement*, they openly declare, that they "would resort to the less chilling creed of the Atheist, rather than admit it."‖ *Justification by faith in Christ*, is also rejected. "To build the hope of pardon on the independent and infinite sufficiency of Jesus Christ, is to build on an unscriptural and false foundation." "Those persons deceive themselves, who, in the apprehension of death, lay hold on the merits of Christ, and expect to enter heaven in consequence."¶ The *future and eternal punishment of the wicked* "is another doctrine which," as we are told, "most Unitarians of the present day concur in rejecting."** They disbelieve the existence of *fallen angels*, and probably also of *holy angels*, representing the language of scripture on this subject as "imagery borrowed from the oriental philosophy, and not to be taken in a literal sense."* Unitarians discard the idea of a *Church*, as separate from the congregation. "The distinction attempted to be kept up between the two," they tell us, "is in most respects artificial, and without a counterpart in nature." They hold that the property of the Church is the property of the congregation; and that the sacrament of the Lord's supper should be open alike to all. "We have no more business," say they, "to shut up this ordinance to a peculiar and chosen few, than we have to treat in a similar manner any of the public services of the sanctuary. We have as much right to stand upon the threshold of a Church, and to forbid any worshipper to enter, as to stand before the communion table, and forbid him to approach." Some indeed maintain that every one, whether layman or clergyman, is authorised and qualified to administer the special ordinances of the gospel.† Unitarians differ from the generality of Christians in regard to the observance of the *sabbath*. They think "there is a general superstition and a Puritanical strictness" on this subject, "which infects and injures the minds of multitudes in this country. We want," say they, "no demure looks, nor gloomy penances, on a day which is pre-eminently designed for the promotion of religion and happiness. There ought to be no unnecessary or severe restraints enjoined."—

* Chris. Disciple, New Series, v. i. p. 386.
† Chris. Examiner, vol. iii. p. 17.
‡ Ware's Letters to Trin. and Cal. p. 24.
§ Chris. Disciple, 1822, pp. 419, 420.
‖ See Lamson's ordination ser. at Danvers.
¶ Chris. Disciple, New Se. vol. i. p. 440, and Chris. Register, Nov. 4, 1826.
** Chris. Dis. New Series, vol. iii. p. 451, and Bancroft's Sermons, pp. 391—409.

* Improved Version of New Test. *passim*, especially p. 422.
† Chris. Register, Sept. 16, 1826, and Ch. Examiner, vol. iii. p. 10, and Mr. Colman's speech before the American Unitarian Association, May 29, 1827.

Children especially ought to be indulged with suitable recreations.* Unitarians are totally averse to an *examination into the religious opinions* of persons, under any pretence, or on any occasion whatever. "No such examination of candidates for ordination, or for admission to our communion or fellowship, with whatever softening pretences it may be proposed, should ever be acquiesced in."† Indeed they hold that mere *error* is innocent, and of no account. "The denunciations of heaven were never uttered against error of faith, but error of practice." "Jesus neither condemned, censured, nor judged any man for his errors."‡ And yet with marvellous consistency, Unitarians denounce the whole system of the Orthodox as "absurd, unscriptural, and *pernicious*," declaring that they consider "transubstantiation itself a *less monstrous doctrine* than the five points of Calvin."‖

We might proceed to greater lengths; but the disclosures already made will enable our readers to judge of the nature of the changes attempted to be introduced, and of the justness of their claims to be regarded as improvements. Unitarians flatter one another with the appellation of *reformers;* and they are endeavoring to pass off this imposition upon the world. But instead of carrying forward the reformation of the sixteenth century, they are laboring to pull down every thing, which those early reformers established, at the peril of their lives, and with the price of their blood. And in place of the actual system of the reformers, they are substituting errors very nearly resembling those, which infested, and troubled, and in some instances rent, the reformed Churches. Our Unitarians would have us believe that they are making great improvements, and have received a vast increase of light, on the subject of religion. But there were Unitarians in the sixteenth century, as well as now; and some who very nearly resembled those of the present day. The reformers were acquainted with them, and with their doctrine; and had they thought it consistent with the Bible they might have embraced it. But so far from this, they rejected and abhorred it. They reasoned, they expostulated, with those who did embrace it; and if incorrigible, excluded them from their company and fellowship.* And could these devoted men, from the celestial glory, now hear and reply to the pretensions of Unitarians in New England to be their coadjutors and followers, we are bound to believe they would disown them. They might be expected to say, 'your foundation and ours is infinitely different. You trust in your own merits; we in the merits of Christ. You think your robes have never been much defiled; ours have been washed and made white in the blood of the Lamb. You refuse divine honors to the Saviour; but we unite forever with the heavenly host in saying, worthy is the *Lamb that was slain* to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing. Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and *to the Lamb*, forever and ever.'

And Unitarians have as little

* Chris. Examiner, vol. iv. p. 115, and Ch. Register, March 11, 1826.

† Chris. Disciple, 1822, p. 54.

‡ Unit. Mis. 1822, p. 175, and 1821, p. 54.

‖ Chris. Examiner, vol. iii. p. 76, and Mr. Gannet's speech before Amer. Unit. Assoc. May 29, 1827.

* See Mosh. Ecc. Hist. vol. iv. p. 471.

claim to be considered the genuine followers of the *Puritans*, as they have of the reformers. It is customary for them to extol the Puritans, especially the early settlers of New England. Nothing is too good, or too honorable, to be said, on certain occasions, in praise of these adventurous and excellent men. But as our Saviour once said to the Pharisees, "If ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham;" so now it may be said to Unitarians, "If ye were the followers of the Puritans, ye would believe their doctrines, and imitate their worthy example." It was the religious *doctrines* of our ancestors which brought them to this country. Had they believed, with modern Unitarians, that mere differences of opinion are of little consequence, and that no man is culpable for his errors; they never would have come here. Their religious doctrines were, not the accidental appendages, but the very elements of their character. These constituted them what they were. With other views of religious truth, they must have been totally different men. On what grounds, then, do those, who reject their religious system throughout, and whose characters are formed under the influence of another Gospel, pretend to be their genuine followers, and their most devoted friends?

It is amusing to consider the various pretences under which Unitarians lay claim to an almost exclusive discipleship of the Puritans.—One is, the Puritans were friends of *religious liberty* and of *free inquiry*; and so, say Unitarians, are *we*.* And what denomination of Christians can be found in New England, who will not respond with them, "So are *we*"? One would think, from the language of Unitarians on this subject, that all around them were in bondage, and that they alone had achieved their spiritual independence. But the truth is, other denominations are as free as they. Others think as they please on the subject of religion, and worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences. —Unitarians seem to infer, because others do not coincide with them, that they cannot possibly be at liberty to judge and act for themselves. But the truth is, other denominations do not coincide with them, because they *are* thus at liberty. They do think as they please on the subject of religion, and for this very reason they are not, and never can be, Unitarians.

In the Tract before us, Unitarians claim moral affinity with their Puritan ancestors, because like them, say they, "we shrink not from an avowal of our dissent from popular and long established errors, from a dread of the cry of innovation." (p. 8.) On reading this, our minds involuntarily reverted to certain published letters which passed from Unitarians in this country to those in England, several years ago. Unitarianism, says a distinguished promoter of the doctrine in Boston, "has spread *very extensively* in New England; but I believe there is only one Church *professedly* Unitarian." Another letter-writer, in the same sentiment, attempts an apology for the studied *concealment* practised by the Unitarian ministers of Boston, in the

* Those who wish to see the good feelings of some Unitarians, and their very ardent love of Christian liberty, most illustriously exemplified, may recur to facts published pp. 319, 320, of the last Vol. of the Christian Magazine.

following terms: "Can it be expected, upon the common principles of human nature, of a body of clergy, nursed in the lap of ease and affluence, and placed in a station of such high secular consideration and comfort, as that of the ministers in Boston, that they should come forward, and by an *open profession of unpopular truth, voluntarily risk the loss of all their temporal dignity and comfort, and incur the contempt and enmity of many, who are now their warmest admirers and friends?* Who will venture to say of himself, that his virtue would be equal to the trial?"* Yet the Unitarian ministers of Boston have now the effrontery to claim alliance with the dauntless Puritans, on the ground of their open and intrepid inculcation of unpopular truth!! "We, like those lion-hearted Christians who first visited our shores, never shrink from an avowal of our dissent from popular and long established errors, from a dread of the cry of innovation, or from the fear of forfeiting our temporal dignity and comfort"!!

But the most ridiculous of all the pretences, on which Unitarians claim affinity with the Puritans, is, not that the Puritans were with them in sentiment, (this is not pretended) but *they believe they* WOULD BE *with them in sentiment, if they were alive at the present time.* Says the writer of the Tract, "I believe, as I believe I live, that if the Fathers of New England, if Robinson, and Higginson, Bradford, and Winthrop, had been born two hundred years later, they would have been found among our warmest and most effective coadjutors." (p. 8.) This truly is a singular ground of alleged discipleship—such, we presume, as was never urged before—and such as any other denomination on earth might urge, with equal reason. Should the Quakers, some of whom had the misfortune to be hung, for their vagaries, in the early days of New England—or the Universalists—or the Swedenborgians, claim to be the genuine followers of the Puritans, because they "believe, as they believe they live, that if the Puritans had been born two hundred years later, they would have been found among their warmest and most effective coadjutors;" the pretence would be just as reasonable in their mouths, as it is in the mouths of modern Unitarians. The truth is our Puritan ancestors were not Quakers, or Universalists, or Swedenborgians; and *neither were they Unitarians.* And the reason why they were not was, not, as the writer of the Tract insinuates, that they were not sufficiently advanced in religious knowledge, and that sufficient truth had not yet "beamed from the sacred word:" for there were Unitarians in the days of our Fathers, and all the leading errors, which have since been broached on the subject of the Trinity, had been broached then. Arius, and Socinus, and a hundred others, had denied this doctrine, and every possible theory respecting the person of Christ had been, by one and another, adopted and inculcated. Pelagius had denied the doctrines of depravity and regeneration. And Arminius had assailed Calvinism at all points, with as much learning and ability as it has ever been assailed since. Our Fathers were not so rude and ignorant that they had never heard of these things. They had heard of them, and they knew them well. They knew

* History of American Unitarianism, pp. 41—46.

as much about Unitarianism, as they desired to know, or as they needed to know; and had they been disposed to embrace it, they had a fair opportunity. But they rejected it. They abhorred it. They could not find it in their Bibles, nor could they find any thing congenial with it, in the temper of their hearts. Had it followed them, they would have extirpated it, or they would have fled from it. Had it been urged upon them, they would have resisted it, even unto death. And could they have forseen that, in less than two centuries, it would spring up in the Churches they were planting, and in the Seminary they were consecrating to the glory of their Saviour, perverting their charities, and poisoning the principles of their children; what would have been their astonishment and grief! The prospect would have wrung their hearts! They would have wept over it, with tears of blood! And yet their Unitarian successors and descendants now rise up and say, "If our Fathers had known as much as we, they would have been Unitarians too! If they had been born two hundred years later, they would have been our warmest and most effective coadjutors!" The poor Pilgrims, it seems, believed and acted as well as they knew, but they did not know but little. They had not made those vast attainments, of which their children vaunt. The reformation from Popery had then but just begun; and the science of "not believing," which is laid down as a first principle of the Unitarian school, was not understood so thoroughly as it is at present.

But though our Puritan ancestors did not know enough to be Unitarians, they knew enough, it seems, to pave and prepare the way for its introduction and progress in future years; as the writer of the Tract before us mentions their *character* and *example* as a first and principal reason of the present prevalence of Unitarianism in New England.—But this is assigning a very strange influence to the example of the worthy Pilgrims. We had supposed that a good example ordinarily had influence, by furnishing inducements for *imitation*. The proper influence of Christ's example is to make us *like* him. And this is the legitimate influence of all good example. But the good example of the Puritans we are told has had a directly contrary influence. It has contributed to introduce and spread a system of religion, such as they rejected and abhorred. They were, to a man, the undoubting believers and promoters of the *Orthodox faith*. The doctrines of Christ's divinity and atonement, of depravity and regeneration, of saints' election and perseverence, with others of a kindred nature, constituted the special nutriment of their souls. These were "the sincere milk of the word," upon which they fed, and by which they thrived. And yet *their example* is now assigned as a reason for the rejection of all these doctrines, and for the introduction of an opposite system—the prevalence of another Gospel! Our Puritan Fathers were the founders and unfailing friends of the *Churches* of New England, strengthening them by their example and influence, and sustaining them by their charities and their prayers. And yet *their example* is now assigned as a prime reason for the introduction of a system, which is breaking down these Churches, stripping them

of their funds, denying them the right to elect their own Pastors, opening their communion to the world, and which is in fact merging them in those mere civil corporations with which they severally stand connected! Our Fathers were also the friends of the *sabbath*, observing it with exemplary devotedness, as near as they were able according to the requisitions of the divine law. But *their example* is now assigned as a reason for the introduction of a system, which "wants no demure looks" upon this sacred day, and sneers even at the imperfect manner in which Orthodox Christians endeavour to keep it, as "a general superstition, and a Puritanical strictness!" But enough of this. The charging of the prevalence of Unitarianism in New England upon the example of our Puritan Ancestors, is the most ridiculous charge ever made, or ever attempted to be refuted. "It is time," says the writer of the Tract, "for men to be done with the senseless clamor, that Unitarians have departed from the principles of the Fathers of New England." But we reply, 'It is time for Unitarians to be done with the senseless clamor, that they have *not* departed from the principles of the Fathers of New England.' The truth is, they have departed from these principles, *toto cœlo*. In the religious world, they, and their Puritan ancestors, are perfect antipodes. Unitarians cannot preach a sermon, in consistency with their own principles, without condemning the principles of their Fathers. They cannot take a step, or lift a hand, for the advancement of their religious system, without virtually passing a vote of censure upon the system of the early settlers of this happy country.

Unitarians may think to atone for their dereliction of the principles of their Fathers, by heaping honors upon their names and memories; but the thought is vain. For after all they can say, the truth of the case remains the same. If their Fathers were right, they are wrong; and if they are right, their Fathers were wrong. They cannot honor their Fathers, without condemning themselves; and they cannot honor themselves, without condemning their Fathers. The truth cannot by any means be concealed or disguised, that Unitarians are a totally different sort of men from the early settlers of this country. In a religious view, there is no communion, or fellowship, or even resemblance, between them. And Unitarianism, so far from being introduced among us by the example of our ancestors, was introduced *in face* of their example. It was introduced, and has prevailed, in *opposition* to the whole weight of their example and influence.

The second cause of the progress of Unitarianism in New England "is to be found," says the Tract, "in the *popular cast of our religious institutions.*" The great body of professing Christians in New England are Congregationalists; and in Massachusetts especially, where Unitarianism has chiefly prevailed, the Churches are not consociated, but retain their individual independence. Hence it is concluded, that the strictly Congregational or Independent form of Church government, is peculiarly favorable to the spread of this doctrine. —For ourselves, we can see no necessary connexion between this

conclusion, and the fact on which it is made to rest. We are ourselves Congregationalists. We are so from principle—from choice; and we can discover no manner of connexion between the peculiarities of Congregational government, and the spread of Unitarian errors. There is not, so far as appears, the remotest tendency in the former to produce the latter. True, Unitarianism has spread in New England, where Congregationalism prevails; but it has spread in other countries, where Congregationalism does not prevail. It spread in the East, in the time of Arius, when the Churches were, in a modified sense, Episcopalian. It has spread in Geneva, where the Churches are Presbyterian. It has extended itself in the different religious establishments of Germany. And in England, while the great body of the Independents or Congregationalists adhere to the principles of the Orthodox faith, nearly all the old Presbyterian churches are said to have become Unitarian.* Facts like these perfectly satisfy us, and they are of a nature, we think, to satisfy the public, that whatever other causes may have contributed to the promotion of Unitarianism in New England, its introduction and progress are not to be charged to the account of Congregationalism.

The last cause mentioned for the progress of Unitarianism among us is "the *interest taken by intelligent laymen in theological discussions.*"—We have but one scruple as to admitting the alleged operation of this cause; and that arises from our doubts as to the existence of the cause itself. We are not yet certain that intelligent laymen, in this part of our country, have commonly been more interested in theological discussions, than they have in some other parts, or in some other countries.—We are aware, that even intelligent laymen too frequently have very little connected knowledge of theology; and what they have, is often of that kind which "puffeth up." While they are mere smatterers in divine things, they are apt to regard themselves as "wiser than their teachers." And when their teachers are willing to be duped and directed by them, we can conceive of disastrous errors as being the probable result. But we are not aware that this has been the case here, more than in many other places. We do not believe that intelligent laymen have taken more interest in theological discussions in New England, than they have in Old England; and we are quite sure that they have not in Massachusetts, the principal seat of Unitarianism, more than they have in Connecticut, where lives but a single Unitarian congregation. For obvious reasons, the Orthodox clergy of New England are objects of the special dislike of Unitarians—a feeling which they miss no good opportunity of expressing. In discussing the topic now under consideration, our author has several comparisons between clergymen and laymen, which ought not to pass unnoticed.—He urges at some length, that the opinions of laymen on theological subjects are deserving of *more regard* than those of clergymen. But is it not strange, that the opinions of professed theologians—those who make theology the study of their lives, should be entitled to less regard than the opinions of those, who attend to it only on incidental occasions? What would be

* See Sabine's Ecclesiastical History.

thought of a similar declaration, coming from either of the other professions? Suppose the members of the Boston Bar should publish to the world, that the opinions of lawyers on subjects of jurisprudence were entitled to less regard, than those of any other class of the community. Or suppose a committee of the Massachusetts Medical Society should publicly and solemnly declare, that physicians were of all men the least acquainted with the science of medicine. What would be thought of such declarations? And what would be thought of such men? They ought in all conscience immediately to disband, and not trouble the world farther with pretensions, which themselves declared were worse than useless. And yet, a committee of the American Unitarian Association —a committee of *clergymen*—not only assert before the public, but labor to prove, that the opinions of clergymen on theological subjects are deserving of less regard than those of laymen! With what face can these reverend gentlemen ever again put on their robes, and lay claim to the titles, the attention, and the respect of clergymen? And what reply could they make to any intelligent layman, who should please to say to them, "Give me your place, and you take mine. As I know more than you on the subject of religion, why should not I be the teacher, and you the learner? Why should not I take the pulpit, and you the slip?"

The writer of the Tract asserts, that in the pretended reformation which Unitarians are thinking to carry on in New England, the laity, and not the clergy, have taken the lead. He also asserts, that "the clergy, as a body, *never yet led the way in improvement*, and *never will. The people always were before them*, and probably *always will be*." (p. 15.) We will not here dispute the point, whether clergymen or laymen have been the most active in endeavoring to spread Unitarianism in New England. It will be in time to decide, to whom the honor of this boasted reformation belongs, when it is well ascertained whether it is a reformation, or not. But we must call in question the truth of the declaration, that "*clergymen never yet led the way in any improvement*"—*in any public reformation*. In their stations, and with their advantages, it would be a shame to them, if this declaration were true; but to the confusion of those clergymen who have published the disgraceful declaration, it may be shown conclusively that it is not true. Who, we ask, are entitled to the credit of spreading Christianity in the primitive age? It was a body of *clergymen*. Peter, and James, and John, and Paul, and all the Apostles of our Lord, were clergymen. And who are entitled to the credit of disenthralling the world from papal bondage? Undoubtedly *clergymen*. Wickliffe was a clergyman. John Huss was a clergyman. Luther and Zuingle were clergymen. Calvin, and Knox, and Cranmer, were clergymen. Indeed, in every stage of this perilous business, we find clergymen standing in the front rank, and fearlessly breasting the bloody onset. And who, we ask farther, are now taking the lead, in the great and benevolent work of spreading the Gospel among the heathen? Who are traversing land and ocean, and exposing themselves in distant and sultry climes, not to en-

rich and aggrandize themselves, but with a view to the spiritual and temporal welfare of their fellow men? They are *clergymen*. The leading missionaries, everywhere, are clergymen;—and those who take the lead in measures for the support of missions, belong to the same class. The English Baptist Missionary Society had its origin in an Association of clergymen. The London Missionary Society was formed at the instance, and by the instrumentality, of clergymen. The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions originated in the General Association of Massachusetts, a meeting composed exclusively of clergymen. Other facts of the same nature might be stated; but they need not be. It is too evident to be proved or denied, that in all the various benevolent efforts, which are now blessing a sinful world, clergymen have stood first and foremost. And yet we hear a committee of clergymen, in and around the metropolis of New England, venting (shall we say) their *spleen* against their professional brethren of all denominations, countries, and ages, past, present, and to come, by publishing before the world, that "*the clergy*, as a body, *never yet led the way in improvement, and never will!! The people always were before them*, and probably *always will be*"!!*

The remarks *here* made, it will be seen, are not at all of a party nature. They are in a common cause, and on a subject in which clergymen, of every name, are vitally interested. And we have no fear, however closely they may bear upon particular individuals, that they will not commend themselves to the consciences of all the friends of the clergy, and the lovers of truth, throughout our country.

As we dissent from the account given by the writer of this Tract of the manner in which Unitarianism has been introduced and propagated in New England, perhaps it will be thought incumbent on us to give our own views in relation to this subject. In doing this, we can little more than repeat the facts which were published, in an authentic history of American Unitarianism, in 1815.—It appears that the first Unitarian minister (Dr. Freeman) was settled in Boston, Nov. 18, 1787. By the labors of this zealous believer in the doctrine, aided by those of a Mr. Hazlitt, in conversing with individuals, and in placing the English Unitarian Tracts in the library of the University, and in most of the social libraries of the city, an impression was ere long made upon the minds of numbers. In opposition to the account given by the writer of the Tract, Dr. Freeman asserts, in a letter written probably in 1797, "The *clergy* are generally the FIRST who begin to speculate; but the *people soon follow*, where they are so much accustomed to read and inquire."* The leaven continued to work with considerable power, though with studied secresy, for a long time; for so late as in 1811, and we believe in 1815, no church in Boston had come out openly on the Unitarian side, except that of Dr. Freeman. But the publication of the history, of which we have spoken, and the controversy

* We speak of this committee as composed of clergymen. It is so, with a single exception. They doubtless regard their publications as open to remark; and they will not, we trust, complain, as the name of the writer of the Tract now before us is withheld, that we consider them responsible for its contents,

* Hist. American Unitarianism, p. 23.

which immediately followed—all in 1815—produced "no small stir" in the Unitarian camp, and were the means of unmasking many, who had long endeavored to be concealed. Those who really *were* Unitarians were soon obliged to be such openly; and from that time to the present, we do not believe the doctrine has made much progress in New England. In Boston, it has been, and is, in a comparative view, declining. If its numbers have increased at all, they have not increased in any proportion so rapidly as those of the Orthodox. And in different parts of the country, though many who were Unitarians before have avowed their sentiments, and some new societies have been formed; we do not think the error itself has made much progress. And, under God, we have now no great fear of its progress in future. The thing has been drawn forth from its lurking places to the light of day—it has been made palpable—people can examine it for themselves—and it lives, henceforth, but to be shunned and to perish with "the hay, wood, and stubble," when the coming "fire shall try every man's work, of what sort it is."

Ordinations and Installations.

Ordained, in Montville, Me. Mr. THOMAS ROBINSON, as an Evangelist. Sermon by Br. D. Ricker.

June 6,—Mr. JOSEPH CONE was ordained at Baltimore, as an Evangelist, in the Baptist connexion. Sermon by Rev. Dr. Staughton.

June 20,—Rev. WM. J. WILCOX was installed Pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Cold-Spring, Cataraugus county, N. Y.

June 27,—At Onesquethaw, in the town of Bethlehem, Albany co. N. Y. Rev. THOMAS HOLIDAY was installed Pastor of the Union Presbyterian Church. Sermon by Rev. H. R. Weed.

July 18,—Mr. GEORGE C. BECKWITH, late Assistant Instructer in the Theological Seminary at Andover, was ordained over the First Congregational Church and Society in Lowell, Mass. Sermon by Rev. Prof. Porter, D. D.

Aug. 2,—Rev. CORNELIUS VAN CLEF was ordained as an Evangelist, by the Classis of Philadelphia.

To Correspondents.—Juvenis is received.

THE

CHRISTIAN MAGAZINE.

VOL. IV. OCTOBER, 1827. No. 10.

SERMON.

1 THESS. v. 7. *They that sleep, sleep in the night.*

IN the book of Ecclesiastes we are taught, that "to every thing there is a season, and a time to every purpose under the heaven: a time to be born, and a time to die: a time to plant, and a time to pluck up that which is planted: a time to kill, and a time to heal: a time to break down, and a time to build up. A time to weep, and a time to laugh: a time to mourn, and a time to dance: a time to cast away stones, and a time to gather stones together: a time to embrace, and a time to refrain from embracing. A time to get, and a time to lose: a time to keep, and a time to cast away: a time to rend, a time to sew: a time to keep silence, and a time to speak: a time to love, and a time to hate: a time of war, and a time of peace." In the above enumeration of times and seasons, Solomon has not mentioned *sleep:* but as he says in general that there is a time to every purpose under the heaven, we may therefore conclude, that there is a time to sleep, and a time to refrain from sleeping. It may sometimes be difficult to determine, when is the proper time to sleep: in the passage from which we have derived our text, the Apostle says, "They that sleep, sleep in the night, and they that be drunken are drunken in the night." From this passage it would seem that when the Apostle wrote his epistle to the Thessalonians, the night was the time that temperate persons devoted to sleep, and the time that the intemperate devoted to drunkenness. But we have reason to believe that the time devoted to sleep and to drunkenness has been altered since the epistle to the Thessalonians was written: last Thursday morning while folding my paper to write this discourse, I observed a man pass my window, apparently so drunken that he could with difficulty walk, and from his appearance I concluded, that his time to be drunken was in the morning: and from what I have observed in our congregation of late, I have been afraid that a number among us had come to the conclusion, that when in the house of God on the Sabbath is the time to sleep. Viewing it of importance to direct your attention to what appears to be an existing evil, it is proposed in the present discourse,

I. To show that the sanctuary is not the place to sleep. And,

II. To illustrate the importance of guarding against this existing evil. I am

I. To show that the Sabbath is not the time nor the sanctuary the place to sleep. The Sabbath is a day of rest from secular employments; but it was

not given for our slothful indulgence of sensual appetites: the sanctuary is the place of our solemnities: here we profess to worship before the Lord our Maker, and hence in the first place,

1. To sleep in the sanctuary is inconsistent with that regard which we ought to have for ourselves. Admitting that we have no regard to the solemnities of the Sabbath and of the sanctuary; admitting that our assembling together is only a ceremony, still we ought to have sufficient respect to our own appearance to conduct the ceremonial with decency. The practice of sleeping in the house of God may become so general, that every one will feel that in doing it, there are enough to keep him in countenance: so any other act of indecorum may become so general in a community as to be considered a matter of course. But when indecorous conduct becomes so general as to be considered a matter of course, we are not to suppose that it is no longer indecorous. For it only shows that in that community the sense of propriety which ought to influence their conduct has ceased to operate. We can easily suppose that the practice of sleeping may become so general as to be extended to the whole congregation, and in that case we can have no doubt that their appearance would be in the highest degree indecent. But that which all may not do without shame, an individual cannot do without detracting from that regard which he ought to pay to his own conduct. Every person has a character to support, and we know that there are some things which no man can do without injury to himself. In the context the Apostle says, "They that be drunken, are drunken in the night," and why does he assume, that drunkards will choose the night rather than the day for their intemperance? Because in the age in which he wrote, drunkenness was so disreputable, that even drunkards were ashamed to be known openly. But in our age, drunkenness has become so general that drunkards now brave the shame and expose their intemperance to the light of day. In the same connexion the Apostle says, "They that sleep, sleep in the night;" and the reason why he assumes this position is, because in that age in which he wrote, the practice of sleeping in their religious meetings was probably unknown. Now it has become in some measure general; but it is not the less indecent. Nor can our practice render it reputable; for no man can be in the practice of sleeping in the house of God without injury to himself: it is a crime which, although it may become *so* general as to be chargeable even upon good men, is revolting to the moral sense of every community. But,

2. We ought not to sleep in the house of God, because the practice directly tends to bring the preaching of the Gospel into contempt. The preached Gospel is the means by which it has pleased God to save them that believe: we may admit, that the means are not of themselves equal to the effect; that they are weak means, yea foolish: but seeing that it has pleased God in all ages to make instruments in themselves feeble, productive of the highest good, we must be allowed to contend that every practice which tends to bring those means into contempt is a crime against God and against social order. Now if whenever

the preacher has named his text, a portion of his audience shall place themselves in the most convenient position to indulge in sleep, I ask, whether their practice has not that tendency? Do they not practically say, Having attended to the prayer and to the singing, there is nothing now to be heard which is worthy our attention? And so far as their example has influence, do they not practically say to all who are awake, There is nothing now to be heard which is worth your attention? And especially will not this be the tendency, if those who indulge in sleep are the more serious and more aged part of the congregation? What hope can the preacher entertain that his discourse will gain the attention and reach the heart of the enemies of truth, while it excites not sufficient interest to guard its professed friends against sensual indulgence in sleep? I know that some plead in justification of the practice, their inability after the active labors of the week to restrain themselves. And that there is a strong tendency to sleep in those who are accustomed to labor through the week, may be readily admitted; but in view of the evil to be avoided and the good to be obtained, this very tendency ought to be only a stronger inducement to guard against indulgence. Is the practice an evil? then the tendency to that practice is an evil, and it ought to be resisted. The word of God nowhere assures us, that they will be allowed to do wrong who are strongly inclined to evil; on the contrary, it commands us to resist temptation, to overcome evil and to resist unto blood striving against sin. It will be universally admitted that were the heart engaged in the solemnities of the sanctuary, it would not be difficult to refrain from sleep: to sleep therefore in the sanctuary only manifests the coldness of your hearts; and why should any among us give public testimony every Sabbath to their own indifference to the institutions of Christ, by which he maketh men wise unto salvation?

3. We ought not to sleep in the sanctuary, because by the indulgence of such a practice we place ourselves beyond the reach of the means of grace. We should readily admit, that those persons greatly injure themselves and their families, who withdraw from the sanctuary of God: but wherein is he different, who habituates himself to sleeping there? In the one case they place themselves beyond the reach of means, and so also do the others. Some appear to claim a right to sleep when doctrines are discussed, because they are not friendly to doctrinal preaching: others appear to claim the same privilege, when a subject that is already familiar is under consideration: and thus one sleeps because he is afraid of light, and another because he expects to hear nothing new. But, does not the existence of such a spirit among any people, destroy the hope of usefulness? The Gospel is not a novelty, neither is it mainly an appeal to the passions of mankind: it contains a system of doctrines and of truths, which have been again and again illustrated for 1800 years. To preach profitably, or to hear profitably, we must not aim at novelty to the rejection of that which is important, neither ought we to admit that there is any doctrine revealed which we can have no interest in hearing discussed. Such an assumption is inconsistent with

that child-like spirit without which we cannot enter the kingdom of God: and the very mention of such excuses for inattention to the means of grace, reveals a heart too proud to enter the kingdom of God.

4. We ought not to sleep in the sanctuary, because it is a sin against God. Sleeping in the house of God is not a disease; but a habit, and like intemperance, or any other evil habit, it gains upon us by indulgence. Now we never excuse those who by habitual indulgence find it difficult to restrain themselves from evil: for in those habits they are voluntary. And on the same principle, God will not hold him guiltless, who in the indulgence of an evil habit places himself beyond the reach of those means of grace, which he has sanctified, and who at the same time lends the force of his example to the introduction of a practice which cannot become general, without reducing the means of grace to contempt. If the magnitude of any sin may be estimated by its bearing on others, then is this practice of sleeping in the house of God, a sin of no common magnitude: for in its relations it is accompanied with many aggravating tendencies. We proceed,

II. To illustrate the importance of guarding against this existing evil. There are evils which on their first appearance strike the friends of religion and order with alarm: there are other evils so insidious that they spring up, take root and extend their influence without obervation. Should some of the members of this church depart from the faith and deny the Lord that bought them, without doubt a great alarm would be excited: but it may be questioned, whether evils equally destructive of vital religion may not take root among us without observation. Among this latter class of evils to be avoided, I am disposed to rank, the practice of sleeping in the house of God. At first view we might hardly be willing to admit, that it is an evil; we should perhaps be rather disposed to consider it an infirmity: yet if we consider the moral influence of this practice, as extending to a whole people, I know nothing that will be more effectual in exerting a deadening influence upon religion. It is not an evil which will excite alarm; in view of its existence we shall hardly be willing to admit that our faith and order are in danger; but it is an evil which so far as it prevails, will produce a moral slumber and a treacherous calm: and,

"Much more this treacherous calm I dread,
Than tempests bursting o'er my head."

It may perhaps be said that in preaching against this practice, I regard only myself, and seek to avoid the pain of addressing those who are asleep, and so far as I am concerned, I confess to you, that it is in its influence, sufficiently chilling: but were I the only person concerned, I think I could be willing to employ my voice as an instrument to hush you to repose. In the preparation of this discourse, I think that I have had respect to your good, rather than my own feelings: it is an evil which I have long lamented, and an evil too, which I am persuaded, if not guarded against, will become general. We have already admitted that in a laboring community there exists a natural tendency to this evil: if therefore to this natural tendency there is superadded the force of example, it is easy to perceive that the practice will be likely to become general. If therefore

any one would plead the difficulty of resisting an inclination to sleep, let him reflect that probably more than half this congregation labor under the same difficulty: from a regard to propriety, or from respect to the solemnities of the sanctuary, many resist this tendency; but every one who yields, does something to weaken that sense of propriety, and to prepare the way for the general prevalence of the practice. Now I am persuaded that there is not one here who would wish to see the practice generally prevail; your sense of propriety would cause you to revolt from the idea, of a whole community assembled in the sanctuary for indulgence in sleep: and I am further persuaded that some who have given countenance by their example to this practice, have never seriously reflected upon its moral tendency: the evil so far as it prevails has crept upon us so insidiously that even those who have been mostly subjected to its influence have not perceived its tendency. Permit me, therefore, as your watchman, to sound the alarm, and to ask, for what are you assembled here? Have you come to present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service? And shall this sacrifice be made, while your senses are steeped in forgetfulness? Look then at the solemnity of your meeting: look on those who will be influenced by your example: look to the cause, to your duty, to your accountability, and then say, What meanest thou, O sleeper, arise, call upon thy God, if so be that God will think upon us, that we perish not.

INFERENCES.

1st. From what has been said we may learn that to the attainment of any good end, attention to things small in themselves is indispensable. Attention to small matters is found to be necessary to success in things secular, and I know not why it should not be equally essential in religious matters. A manufacturer may at a great expense provide suitable buildings and machinery: but after all his labor, he will find that ultimate success will depend on the care and attention which he bestows on small savings and on the minute parts of his establishment. You, my hearers, have at a great expense and with much labor provided a commodious building for the worship of God, and we hope that you desire to promote the cause of religion in your own community; but like the manufacturer, in order to success, you must pay more strict attention to the minute parts of your conduct. A fine meeting-house, is no higher evidence of religion in a community, than the exterior deportment is of piety in an individual. Now you know that it was the characteristic of the ancient Pharisees, that while they paid the strictest attention to external deportment, they tolerated in their hearts the most rank corruption. Hence our Saviour compared them to a sepulchre, which on the outside was beautifully painted, but within was full of all corruption. Hence therefore in order to form a judgment of the state of religion among us, we must not be satisfied with the exterior of our house of worship; for it is not the house, but the assembly, which gives the direction to character. Now we will suppose that a stranger has come among us for the purpose of forming a judgment of our religious character: his first impressions would be favorable, for

he would first regard the outward appearance; but when he came to take a nearer view, when he observed a sleepy congregation, listless and indifferent, would he not say, Ah, this people have washed the outside of the cup and the platter; but they seem to pay no attention to that which is yet more indispensably necessary to their success as a religious community. Would you be unwilling to be thus made the object of remark to a stranger? Then realize that God sees you, that he scrutinizes your conduct yet more closely than any stranger could do; and realize that you are the object of remark to one another, that you cannot sleep without being observed, that your conduct in this indulgence will exert a chilling influence on all around you, and that if you would promote the cause of religion, you must not sleep as do others, but watch and be sober.

2. From our subject we learn, that we are in danger of losing that reverential awe, which ought to be felt in our assemblies of religious worship. Under the old dispensation, many ceremonies were instituted which tended to give solemnity to religious worship: the new dispensation has abrogated those ceremonies; for the Gospel addresses itself not to our corporeal senses, but to the understanding and to the heart. Our religious worship is better fitted to enlarge the mind and to instruct the intellect than theirs; but it is not so well adapted to strike the sense and to captivate the imagination. We do not praise God on loud sounding instruments; we burn no incense; we have no holy of holies into which the high priest may enter with a thousand ceremonies; our worship is not connected with feasting and sacrifices; we are simply called to exercise our faculties of mind, in offering unto God a rational sacrifice of our hearts. Hence, unless we can be made to think and made to feel, there is nothing in our worship to fill the mind with reverence; for it is not addressed to the eye nor to the ear, but to the understanding and to the heart. To a thinking people, to those who are disposed to reflect, we grant that there is enough in our mode of worship to solemnize every mind; for we speak of God, of eternity, of heaven and of hell: we grant that to an intellectual people there is no form of religion so powerful as the simple testimony of the Gospel: but if a people will not hear, if they will not give their hearts to receive instruction, then they are in great danger of losing all that reverence of God which ought to be felt in religious worship. Solomon says, "Keep thy foot, when thou goest to the house of God, and be more ready to hear than to give the sacrifice of fools." By the sacrifice of fools, he probably designed to reprove that admiration of show and ceremony which was doubtless one of the evils of their ceremonial worship: but with us the sacrifice of fools will not be bestowed on show and ceremony, it will rather be manifested in listless inattention and cold indifference.

3. So far as the present subject is applicable to our circumstances, we have reason to believe that the spirit and power of religion are not felt among us. The power of religion is at the farthest possible remove from sluggishness and inactivity; it pierceth the heart, it renovates the soul; if any thing in the world can make a man active, lively, and engaged,

it is the exercise of truly religious affections. Hence the Psalmist speaks of praising God with all the heart, and of worshipping God with all his strength; and in other parts of his Psalms he explains what he means by these expressions: he speaks of rising at midnight to worship God and of going up to the sanctuary with exceeding joy. Paul also in the exercise of the same spirit, speaks of being constrained by the love of Christ, and in other passages he explains his meaning by saying, that for Christ's sake he had suffered the loss of all things, and that he accounted them but dross, when compared with the excellency of his Lord. Now when we compare our own sluggish inactivity and dulness in religion with the holy energy of Paul and David, we seem to be men of a different spirit. Judging of the influence which religion has upon our own energies we may well question whether there is not an essential difference between their religion and ours. Were a person under the influence of their spirit to come among us, were he to witness our coldness and our disposition to sleep in the house of God, would he not say, that we had no religion? And if there is such ground for suspicion, is it not our duty to take up the subject and make our own case a matter of serious reflection before God?

4. If what has been said is applicable to our circumstances, then it becomes us to remove this existing evil far from us. In the spirit of meekness, I would ask you, fathers and brethren, What is to be done? We have admitted that your employment through the week, creates a tendency to sleep when in the house of God; and perhaps you will go further and say, that this tendency cannot be resisted. And if it cannot be resisted, what then is to be done? Are our solemn meetings to be thus perverted? Is the preached Gospel to be as the sound of an instrument to hush us to repose? God has commanded us to reverence his sanctuary; and have we such a disposition to sleep that we cannot obey this command? If we cannot resist a tendency to sleep, then the command of God is unreasonable; for he has said, "Reverence my sanctuary, I am the Lord." And if we must sleep in the sanctuary, then it is clear that we cannot obey this command; for we should consider it quite disrespectful to sleep in a private circle of friends, and how can we reverence the sanctuary and yet do that which we could not do in a private circle, without a breach of good manners? The fact is, it is an idle and a pernicious habit, which ought to be resisted: it is one of those insidious evils which steals upon us at unawares: but it is not the less an evil; for unless overcome, it will carry us in a downward course, until we become a congregation of sleepers. And what then shall be done? This must depend upon yourselves, my hearers: it is for you to determine whether you shall sleep or not. Do you say, that you cannot prevent it? One thing you can do: instead of fixing upon a convenient position, you can fix upon one where it would be extremely difficult to sleep: instead of covering, you can uncover your eyes; and instead of lolling, you can stand up.

The greatest friend of truth is Time, her greatest enemy is Prejudice, and her constant companion is Humility.

From the Utica Christian Repository.

THE PILGRIM'S PROGRESS IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.—BY BUNYANUS.

CHAPTER XIX.

Love-self. It seems to me that brother Thoughtful's notions of christian character condemn every body. He would allow none to be christians but such as exercise that love which is the fulfilling of the law. But, it is written, "there is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good and sinneth not."

Thoughtful. It would be of no use for us to attempt to justify those whom the great Judge condemns. And he certainly condemns all those who are destitute of holiness. Holiness is conformity to the moral law, which is the only rule of right and wrong. No man has any more holiness, than he has of conformity to the moral law.

Love-s. But what I mean is, that your scheme seems to require perfection, and to condemn all who are not perfect; and since the best of men are imperfect, it condemns the best of men as well as the worst.

Th. Uninterrupted conformity to the moral law is required of all men as a duty; but uninterrupted conformity to the moral law is not made the condition of pardon and salvation. If it were, there would be no hope for any. But, if a man is *never* conformed to that law, he *never* does any thing right, he never has the same mind that was in Christ, he never delights in the law of God after the inward man, he never walks after the Spirit, he *always* walks after the flesh, and shall die. If he never exercises that love which is the fulfilling of the law, he never possesses the temper of one that is "born of God, and knoweth God." If he never "doeth righteousness," but always "committeth sin," he is not a child of God, but is a child of the devil. Good men are those who are sometimes conformed to the moral law, who perform some right actions, who sometimes have the same mind that was in Christ, and sometimes delight in the law of God after the inward man. But the best of men in this world are imperfect, as they are not always conformed to the moral law, and their right actions are intermingled with such as are wrong.

Love-s. Your scheme would still condemn me; for I do not think so highly of myself as to suppose I was ever conformed to the law for a single moment, or that I ever, for the smallest space of time, observed it with my whole heart. My only hope is, that my poor attempts will be accepted for the prince Immanuel's sake; and that my imperfections will be covered up with the robe of his perfect righteousness, so that the great Judge will see no spot in me. And this, I think, puts the highest honor upon him, as the sole author of my salvation.

Th. Can you expect that *sin* will be accepted by a holy being? And do you think you put honor upon the prince Immanuel, by hoping that *sin* will be accepted for his sake? What is this, but to make him the minister of sin? If your "poor attempts," as you call them, do not any of them come up to the law, they do altogether fall short of it. And if they altogether fall short of it, they are altogether sin. And it must be a vain hope, to suppose that any thing can hide your sins from the eye of the omniscient Judge, who has said he will "bring every work into judg-

ment, whether it be good, or whether it be evil." The prince Immanuel is indeed the sole author of our salvation. But it appears to me most honorable to him to suppose he accomplishes it by saving us *from* our sins, and not *in* them; and that, instead of covering up our sins, so that the eye of Omniscience cannot see them, though we continue in them, he will, by his Holy Spirit, bring us to repent of our sins and forsake them, and by his blood, procure our pardon; and that he will carry on the work by causing us "to walk in his statutes," and to "keep his judgments and *do* them," till "by patient continuance in *well doing*," we are fitted for "glory, and honor, and immortality."

Love-s. If you believe your own scheme, you probably think you do, sometimes, observe the moral law with your whole heart, and perform some actions which in themselves are right in the sight of God. But my scheme does not lead me to think so highly of myself. And let me give you the caution which is given by an apostle to every man, "not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think."

Th. The caution is not unnecessary for me, and I desire to observe it, in its full extent, and what is added also, "but to think soberly, according as God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith." And it seems to me, that if the caution is necessary on my system, which teaches that God will accept of nothing but what comes up to his law, but abhors every thing which falls short of it, it is more necessary on your system, which teaches that he will accept of many things which altogether fall short of his law, and will cover up all that he does not acccpt. If I think soberly, according to the measure of the grace which is given to me, and do not suppose that to be right in the sight of God which is really an abomination to him; if I form a just estimate of my own character, and view all my actions as God views them, and feel accordingly, I conclude I shall not transgress the apostle's precept. The angels in heaven and the spirits of the just made perfect, doubtless think that the exercises of their hearts are such as come up to the moral law; and yet, they are not chargeable with thinking more highly of themselves than they ought. A saint of old could say with truth, "With my whole heart have I sought thee;—give me understanding, and I shall keep thy law; yea, I shall observe it with my whole heart;—I entreated thy favor with my whole heart;—I cried with my whole heart;—I will keep thy precepts with my whole heart;—I will praise thee with my whole heart." And that he did not think too highly of himself in this, appears from the testimony of the great Searcher of hearts, who says of him, "My servant David, who kept my commandments, and who followed me with all his heart, to do that which is right in mine eyes." If we do not serve God with the whole heart, we do not serve him at all. When one inquired whether he might be baptized, it was answered, "if thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest." This implies, that if he did not believe with all his heart, he would have no right; the not doing it with all his heart would be the same as not doing it at all, but only making a hypocritical pretence, according to that divine declaration, "Judah hath not

turned unto me with her whole heart, but feignedly." The heart cannot be divided, and a part given to one object and a part to the contrary, at the same moment. "No man can serve two masters; for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon." This must mean, no man can serve two masters, *at the same time*; for it is plain that he can at different times, one after the other. No man is ever conscious of both loving and hating the same object, at the same time, and in the same sense. The heart may be very quick in its changes from one object to its contrary; but in the same instant of time it is wholly on one side or the other. It is written, "He that is not with me is against me." It is also written, "The light of the body is the eye: If therefore thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light. But if thine eye be evil, thy whole body shall be full of darkness." Nothing is here said about its being partly light and partly darkness; but it is represented as being full of one, or full of the other. It is also written, "If we love one another, God dwelleth in us, and his love is perfected in us." Also, "A good man, out of the good treasure of his heart, bringeth forth that which is good; and an evil man, out of the evil treasure of his heart, bringeth forth that which is evil: for of the abundance of the heart his mouth speaketh. If a man's heart is good, he is a good man; but if his heart is evil, he is an evil man; and not partly one and partly the other, at the same instant. When a man is renewed, the heart of stone is represented as *taken away*, and a new heart given, which could not be the case, if the heart of stone remained, and a new principle were only implanted in some part of it. The practical error, against which we need to be cautioned, I conclude to be, that of supposing those actions to be right, and acceptable with God, which are really not right, because they do not come up to the moral law. If we felt our obligations to condemn ourselves, and to abhor ourselves, for every thing in us which does not come up to the moral law, and judged impartially of ourselves, according to that rule, we should doubtless find occasion to humble ourselves before God for very many of those things for which we now think highly of ourselves and are highly thought of by others. And instead of flattering ourselves that they will be accepted for the prince Immanuel's sake, we should expect they would be condemned and abhorred by all holy *beings*, and should loathe and abhor ourselves on account of them, and repent in dust and ashes.

Love-self. Why is not your scheme the same as brother Feelwell's doctrine of perfection? He thinks that many attain to perfection, and live for days, and months, and even years, without committing any sin. And I see not why you do not embrace the same opinion.

Th. I do not suppose that any live for days, and months, and years, without committing any sin. I would not venture to affirm that any mere man ever lived an hour or a minute in the uninterrupted exercise of holy affection. Every man, that has attended to the operations of his own mind, must be conscious that his thoughts follow each other with amazing rapidity;

and doubtless our affections are as rapid in their succession, and as changeable in their nature, as our thoughts are. But I conclude there are other points of difference between the views which I have exhibited and his doctrine of perfection.

Feel-well. Yes; for you would have it that we are under obligation to keep the moral law, and to be as perfect as Adam was before he fell, which I do not believe at all.

Th. What, then, is your standard of perfection, if it is not the moral law, the law under which Adam was in the garden, and under which the angels are in heaven?

F. w. It is the law of faith.

Th. Does your law of faith require less than was required of Adam before he fell, less than is required of the angels in heaven?

F. w. Yes. The author whom I most highly esteem, discoursing on this subject, says, "The Adamic law is in substance the same with the angelic law, being common to angels and men. It required that man should use to the glory of God, all the powers with which he was created. Consequently, this law, proportioned to his original powers, required that he should always think, always speak, and always act precisely right, in every point whatever. He was well able to do so. And God could not but require the service he was able to pay. But Adam fell; and his incorruptible body became corruptible: and ever since it is a clog to the soul, and hinders its operations. Consequently no man is able to perform the service which the Adamic law requires. And no man is obliged to peform it; God does not require it of any man. For Christ is the end of the Adamic as well as the Mosaic law."

Th. Do you mean to include the *moral law*, when you speak of the Mosaic law?

F. w. Yes. To use the words of my author again, by "the Mosaic law," I mean, "the whole Mosaic dispensation; which St. Paul continually speaks of as one, though containing three parts, the political, *moral*, and ceremonial. By his death Christ put an end to both" the Adamic and the Mosaic law: "He hath abolished both the one and the other, with regard to man; and the obligation to observe either the one or the other is vanished away. Nor is any man living bound to observe the Adamic more than the Mosaic law. In the room of this, Christ hath established another, namely, the law of faith. Not every one that doeth, but every one that believeth, now receiveth righteousness in the full sense of the word, that is, he is justified, sanctified, and glorified. We are dead to the law by the body of Christ given for us; to the Adamic as well as Mosaic law. We are wholly freed therefrom by his death; that law expiring with him."

No-law. Let me interrupt you, to express my approbation. "Not every one that *doeth*, but every one that *believeth*, now *receiveth* righteousness, in the full sense of the word." That is just as I believe. We never *do* any righteousness; we only *receive* by faith, the finished righteousness that is wrought out for us. And we are not required to *do* any. "By the body of Christ we are dead to the Adamic as well as the Mosaic law; we are wholly freed therefrom by his death, that law expiring with him." I agree to that, most cordially; and am happy

find that we are so well united in this fundamental article of our religion.

Th. How then are we, as the apostle says, "Not without law to God, but under the law to Christ?"

F. w. My author answers that very question. These are his words: "We are without *that* law. But it does not follow that we are without any law. For God has established another law in its place, even the law of faith."

Th. Here, then, is a fundamental and essential difference between your system and mine. I suppose the moral law to be the eternal and immutable rule of right, to which God himself is conformed in all his ways, and to which the holy angels are conformed in all they do. To this law Adam was entirely conformed while in a state of innocence. And after he fell, he was no less bound to be conformed to it than before, his sin not diminishing his obligations. And to the same law all men are bound to conform, all the time. And they are well able to do it; for it requires no more than the constant right employment of all the powers they have, be they more or less. If the powers of men are diminished by the fall, that does not lessen their ability to keep the law; for he that has the least ability can do what he can, as well as he that has the greatest; and the law requires no more than all the heart, and all the soul, and all the strength, and all the mind. But you suppose this law to be set aside by the gospel, contrary to the express declaration of the apostle, "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law." And you suppose another law has been substituted in its place, which you call the law of faith. What do you suppose your new law requires?

F. w. It requires love. My author says, "The whole law under which we now are, is fulfilled by love. Faith working or animated by love, is all that God now requires of man. He has substituted love in the room of angelic perfection. The foundation is faith, purifying the heart: the end love, preserving a good conscience."

Th. How does faith work by love?

F. w. God by his Holy Spirit reveals his love to me, and shows me that he has taken away my sins, saying to me, "thou art an heir of God, a joint heir with Christ." This direct witness of the Spirit I believe, which is faith. This fills my soul with joy, and makes me love him because he first loved me.

No-law. Here too I cannot withhold my approbation. This is my experience exactly.

Love-self. And it is mine too, in the substance of it. But let us not interrupt. I wish to hear a full account of brother Feelwell's doctrine of perfection.

Th. Were I disposed to argue upon the points now stated, I should endeavor to show, that your statements are all wrong; that your notion of a direct witness of the Spirit is a delusion; and that believing that your sins are forgiven before you love God, is believing a lie; that justifying faith is not a belief that your sins are forgiven, but a cordial acquiescence in the gospel method of salvation; and that all the love which springs merely from God's supposed love to you, is selfish and wicked. But it is my present wish to obtain your views on the

subject of perfection. Having cast away the moral law as the rule of right, and substituted a new law requiring less, you suppose, of course, that some live up to all that is required by *that* law, do you not?

F. w. No. My author says again, "christian perfection is pure love, filling the heart and governing all the words and actions." But, "A man may be filled with pure love, and still be liable to *mistake*. A mistake in opinion may occasion a mistake in practice. Every such mistake is a transgression of the perfect law. Therefore, every such mistake, were it not for the blood of the atonement, would expose to eternal damnation. The best of men still need Christ in his priestly office, to atone for their omissions, their short comings, their mistakes in judgment and practice, and their defects of various kinds. For these are all deviations from the perfect law, and consequently need an atonement. Yet that they are not properly sins, we apprehend may appear from the words of St. Paul; 'He that loveth another hath fulfilled the law; for love is the fulfilling of the law.' Now, mistakes, and whatever infirmities necessarily flow from the corruptible state of the body, are no way contrary to love, nor therefore in the scripture sense *sin*. Not only sin properly so called, that is, a voluntary transgression of a known law, but sin improperly so called, that is, an involuntary transgression of a divine law, known or unknown, needs the atoning blood. I believe there is no such perfection in this life as excludes these involuntary transgressions;"—but "such transgressions," I do not call *sins*." "These souls dwell in a shattered body, and are so pressed down thereby, that they cannot always exert themselves as they would, by thinking, speaking, and acting *precisely right*. For want of better bodily organs, they must, at times, think, speak, or act wrong; not indeed through a defect of *love*, but through a defect of knowledge. And while this is the case, notwithstanding that defect, and its consequences, they fulfil the law of love."

Th. I am not able to see why your statement is not self-contradictory. You say, "they fulfil the law of love," and yet speak of such "omissions, short comings, defects of various kinds, deviations from the perfect law, and even transgressions of it," as "need the atoning blood," and without it, would expose to eternal damnation."

F. w. It is the statement of a man wiser than you or I; and whatever you may think of it, I am resolved to believe it is entirely right, and perfectly consistent. And I know many, who, as my author says, "are saved in this world from all sin, from all unrighteousness; they are now in such a sense perfect as not to commit sin, and to be freed from all evil desires and evil tempers. *At all times* their souls are even and calm; their hearts are steadfast and immoveable. Their peace, flowing as a river, passeth all understanding. They rejoice evermore, pray without ceasing, and in every thing give thanks. Their souls are *continually* streaming up to God, in holy joy, prayer, and praise. This is a point of fact. And this is plain, sound, scriptural experience."

Th. Do you suppose that all christians, all who are justified by faith, have attained this perfection?

F. w. No. I suppose that when

a man attains it, he experiences, as my author says, another "change, immensely greater than that wrought when he was justified; when, after having been fully convinced of inbred sin, by a far deeper and clearer conviction, than that which he experienced before justification, and after having experienced a gradual mortification of it, he experiences a total death to sin, and an entire renewal in the love and image of God."

Th. It is now evident how widely your doctrine of perfection differs from mine. I believe that all christians in this life, are both perfect and imperfect in the same sense that any are, namely, in having some holy and some unholy affections, in rapid succession; and that the term *perfect* is, in the scriptures, applied to all christians, being synonymous with *saints*, or sanctified ones: But you believe that some who are in a justified state are perfect Christians, or sanctified ones, and others are not. I believe that no christian lives a single day, and perhaps not a single hour, or a single minute, in the uninterrupted exercise of holy affection; but you believe, that those you call sanctified, live for months and years without committing any sin, being, "at all times" in the uninterrupted exercise of perfect love. I believe that the moral law, which the angels keep, and under which Adam was placed in the garden, and which was communicated in the ten commands at Mount Sinai, is the only standard of perfection, the only rule of right and wrong, and that every man is bound to keep it without interruption: But you believe that law is taken away, and that no man is now under obligation to keep it;—but that a new law, which requires less, is substituted in its room. I believe that no affections or actions are holy, but such as come up to the moral law; and that all those affections and actions which fall short of the moral law are sins: But you believe that your perfect ones, who live without committing any sin, are chargeable with very many "deviations" from your new and milder law, and many "transgressions" of it, which, "were it not for the blood of atonement, would expose to eternal damnation," but which, nevertheless, are not *sins*. In these points, and others connected with them, we differ totally.

Love-self. I perceive these differences plainly enough; and though I am not prepared to give my assent to all brother Feelwell's statements, I confess they are far less repugnant to my feelings than brother Thoughtful's, to which I can never assent, because they go to destroy all my hopes.

For the Christian Magazine.

ARGUMENT OF THE UNIVERSALISTS FROM REV. V. 13, CONSIDERED.

And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, forever and ever.

An understanding of the scriptures is of peculiar importance. If we misinterpret these, and receive from them falsehood instead of truth, they do not add to our knowledge, but to our ignorance. The more of the scriptures we have treasured up in our memories with erroneous ideas attached to them, the deeper are we

involved in spiritual darkness. The scriptures are capable of being *wrested*, and wrested too to our destruction. That is, a false, instead of a true interpretation may be given to them, and its practical effects may be destruction, instead of salvation. It becomes us to approach the scriptures as the word of God, as the Sovereign arbiter of all controversy respecting religion, as an infallible standard from which there is no appeal. We should approach them too with a supreme desire to know the truth, and a readiness to submit to all its practical results. We should ever guard against a rash and hasty judgment, especially where formidable difficulties present themselves to our minds, and patiently consider every circumstance which is essential to the acquisition of truth. The words at the head of this article are very differently interpreted by different men. Some, supposing them "to look forward to the completion of the scheme of God" on earth, view them as an unequivocal support to the doctrine of universal salvation. Dr. Chauncey and many other universalists have quoted them to prove this doctrine. We not only find them in the writings of universalists, but we often hear them repeated in conversation, as affording satisfactory evidence that all will be saved. Now if it is a fact that they do support this doctrine, we all ought to know it, and to dismiss our fears of future and eternal punishment. But if they do not, when fairly interpreted, give any ground to hope that all will be saved, it is important that this should be known, both as the means of preventing self-deception, and imposition upon others. The propriety of making them the subject of a critical and thorough investigation will, therefore, be readily seen. My *first* observation upon this passage is, that it must be understood either in a restricted or unrestricted sense, that is, that *every creature*, means every *individual* creature of every description, or that it does *not* mean every *individual* creature. Here there can be no dispute. All will agree that when the Apostle says, "And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, forever and ever," he either means that he heard every *individual* creature of every description in heaven and on earth praising God, or he does *not* mean that he heard every *individual* creature of every description. Now the question is, which does he mean? Can we suppose that he means every *individual* creature without any exception? If so, then he heard not only intelligent creatures as mankind, but all the beasts, and birds, and insects, and reptiles, and fishes, with which the earth, the air and the sea abound, actually engaged in songs of praise to their Creator. Now can we suppose that this was a fact? No, you will answer, as he was evidently speaking of rational creatures only, it is not necessary to suppose that he meant any others. Very well, then I observe,

2. That if he was speaking of holy creatures, it is not necessary to suppose that he meant by every creature all the human race, but only every saint. Now that he was speaking of holy creatures, and those only, just

before he uttered the words before us, we need only to turn to the chapter to satisfy ourselves. We there find that he had just been speaking of the worship which Christ received in heaven, and in the passage before us he gives us an account of the worship which he received on earth. He seems at once to have had a view of the worship which was paid to Christ both in heaven and on earth. And in the description of it which he gives in this passage, he meant to inform us, not that all mankind were engaged in it, but that *every* saint or holy person, whether he were alive on the earth, or whether his body were sleeping in the dust, or whether he were among those whom the ocean had embosomed, was bearing an humble part in this interesting duty. "And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, forever and ever." As this is a description of holy worship paid to the Son of God, it is natural to understand all that is said in it as restricted to those who are *prepared* to worship him, in a holy manner. But,

3. A moment's attention to the *time*, when the song here described was sung, is sufficient to convince any candid mind that by every creature, is not meant every *individual* created being, but, every holy creature. What the apostle heard was something which *then* took place, and not something which was to take place afterwards. This was before any of the seals of the book were opened. It is what John saw and heard respecting the character of him, who was to open the seals of the book. In proof of this, let us look one moment to the chapter in which it is recorded. "And I saw in the right hand of him that sat on the throne a book, written within and on the backside, sealed with seven seals. And I saw a strong angel proclaiming with a loud voice, Who is worthy to open the book, and to loose the seals thereof? And no man in heaven, nor in earth, neither under the earth, was able to open the book, neither to look thereon. And I wept much, because no man was found worthy to open, and to read the book, neither to look thereon. And one of the elders saith unto me, Weep not: behold the Lion of the tribe of Juda, the root of David, hath prevailed to open the book, and to loose the seven seals thereof. And I beheld, and lo, in the midst of the throne, and of the four beasts, and in the midst of the Elders, stood a *Lamb as it* had been slain, *having* seven horns, and seven eyes, which are the seven Spirits of God sent forth into all the earth. And he came and took the book out of the right hand of him that sat upon the throne. And when he had taken the book, the four beasts, and four and twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps, and golden vials full of odors, which are the prayers of the saints. And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation: And hast made us unto our God kings and priests: and we shall reign on the earth. And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels

round about the throne, and the beasts, and the elders: and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands; saying, with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing. And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, forever and ever. And the four beasts said, Amen. And the four and twenty elders fell down and worshipped him that liveth forever and ever." This, it will be noticed, is the view which John in vision had of heaven and of earth *before* the revelation of those future events, which in subsequent chapters he records, was made known to him. This book, which he here saw, and which none but the Lion of the tribe of Juda, the Lamb slain, or in plain language the Son of God, was found worthy or able to open, contained the revelations which were subsequently made to John. This apostle was permitted to stand by Christ, and to be made acquainted with the contents of the book, as the seals one after another were broken open. "And I saw," he says, "when the Lamb opened one of the seals; and I heard, as it were the noise of thunder, one of the four beasts, saying, come and see. And I saw, and behold; a white horse, and he that sat on him had a bow; and a crown was given unto him; and he went forth conquering, and to conquer." While John is permitted to stand by the Son of God, one seal after another is opened, and the events which were in due time to take place, but which were before a secret to the world, were revealed under their appropriate symbols. And as they are revealed he records them, and the record of what was communicated at the opening of the seven seals, is the revelation which the apostle John has made to us. But what I desire may be particularly noticed here is, that the words under consideration are a description of the homage which was made to Christ, at the time when he appeared to open the seals of this book. This is not a vision of what is to take place in heaven, or in earth hereafter, it is a vision of what actually took place at the time when Christ made his revelation to the apostle. Every holy creature which was in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as were in the sea, and all that were in them John heard, saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power be unto him that sitteth on the throne, and to the Lamb, at *the time when the Lamb appeared to open the seals of the book*, which was during the life of this apostle. Now I say that this circumstance shows, that the language here used must be understood in a restricted sense, that is, it must be understood as spoken not of every individual of the human race, but only of every one that was holy. The apostle looked at angels in heaven, and to saints on earth, to all the saints, to those who were then alive, to those whose bodies were enclosed in the earth, and to those who had at various times perished in the sea, and saw that they were all rendering homage to the Son of God, who is the only suitable personage in the universe to disclose the secrets of futurity.

It was then a fact, as it ever has been since, that true saints honored the Son, as they honored the Father. But it was not then a fact, nor has it ever been since, that all of the human race, have believed in Christ, and paid him this supreme homage. It is evident then from the time when the event which is the subject of this vision took place, that the language in which it is recorded must be understood with the restrictions which have been mentioned. Those who attempt to prove by this passage, that all will be saved, consider it as descriptive of what will take place at the final consummation of all things. From the circumstance, that John heard every creature in heaven and in earth praising God and the Lamb, they infer that at the completion of his scheme on earth, to which they suppose this refers, all mankind will be made holy, and consequently happy. They suppose that this passage is descriptive of the happy state of things, which will then take place. But if they will only examine this subject thoroughly, they will perceive that whatever these words imply, they had their fulfillment in the days of the apostle John. And if all mankind were not then holy and happy, it cannot be inferred from this passage that they ever will be. As an important revelation of future events was about to be made to John, a revelation of events which deeply concerned him, and the whole church, as well as the world, it was proper that both he and they should know the character of him who was to make this revelation. Accordingly, at the moment when the Lion of the tribe of Juda, comes forward to break the seals of the book of providence, the apostle is shown, that he is a personage whom all holy beings both in heaven and in earth worship. "And when he had taken the book, the four beasts, and four and twenty elders fell down before the Lamb—and they sung a new song, saying, Worthy is the Lamb to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood. And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, heard I saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne and to the Lamb, forever and ever." It must, therefore, appear to my readers, as it does to me, not a little astonishing, that this passage which is clearly descriptive of an event which took place at the very opening of the revelations of the apostle John, should be applied to the final consummation of all things: or that *what is* said of a period when the greater part of mankind are known to have been enemies of Christ, should be interpreted to show that they will all eventually celebrate his praise. Only consider this passage, as descriptive of holy beings both in heaven, and and on the earth, and the worship which they as one great community did from the beginning and have ever since rendered him, and every thing pertaining to it appears perfectly natural and easy to be understood. But to make it descriptive of every individual of the human race hereafter, is not only to give it an interpretation which is contrary to a plain matter of fact, but which is attended with *other* insuperable difficulties.

[To be continued.]

SIR MATTHEW HALE ON SANCTIFYING THE SABBATH.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

HAVING observed that you sometimes admit into your miscellany such portions of scarce or unpublished works as may promote its excellent design, I take the liberty to communicate an extract from a letter of Sir Mathew Hale to his grand-children, which has never been printed, but lies deposited, I believe, unknown to the former editors of his works, in the British Museum. If I have not formed too high an estimate of the authority of that truly wise and pious man, his testimony to the good effects resulting from a strict observance of the Christian Sabbath will prove not unacceptable to you and your readers. Should you, from this specimen, feel any wish to peruse the remainder of the letter, I shall be most happy to leave my transcript of it with your publisher. I cannot conclude this without expressing my humblest and most heartfelt thankfulness for the benefits I have derived from your labors. G. W.

"I will acquaint you with a truth, that above forty years' experience and strict observation of myself hath assuredly taught me. I have been near fifty years a man as much conversant in business, and that of moment and importance, as most men; and I will assure you, I was never under any inclination to fanaticism, enthusiasm, or superstition.

"In all this time, I have most industriously observed, in myself and my concerns, these three things:—1. Whenever I have undertaken any secular business on the Lord's day (which was not absolutely and indispensably necessary,) that business never prospered and succeded well with me.

"Nay, if I had set myself that day but to forecast or design any temporal business, to be done or performed afterwards, though such forecast were just and honest in themselves, and had as fair a prospect as could be effected, yet I have been always disappointed in the effecting of it, or in the success of it. So that it grew almost proverbial with me, when any importuned me to any secular business that day, to answer them, that if they suspected it to succeed amiss, then they might desire my undertaking of it upon that day. And this was so certain an observation of me, that I feared to think of any secular business that day, because the resolution then taken would be disappointed or unsuccessful.

"That always, the more closely I applied myself to the duties of the Lord's-day, the more happy and successful were my business and employments of the week following. So that I could, from the loose or strict observance of that day, take a just prospect and true calculation of my temporal successes in the ensuing week.

"Though my hands and mind have been as full of secular business, both before and since I was a judge, as it may be any man's in England, yet I never wanted time in my six days to ripen and fit myself for the business and employments I had to do, though I borrowed not one minute from the Lord's-day to prepare for it, by study or otherwise. But on the other hand, if I had at any time borrowed from this day any time for my secular employments, I found it did further me less than if I had let it alone; and therefore, when some year's experience, upon a most attentive and

vigilant observation, had given me this instruction, I grew peremptorily resolved never in this kind to make a breach upon the Lord's-day, which I have now strictly observed for above 30 years.—This relation is most certainly and experimentally true, and hath been declared by me to hundreds of persons, as I now declare it to you."

From the Tract Magazine.

FAMILY PRAYER.

A pious tradesman conversing with a minister on family worship, related the following instructive circumstance respecting himself.

"When I first began business for myself, I was determined, through grace, to be particularly conscientious with respect to family prayer. Accordingly, I persevered, for many years in the delightful practice of domestic worship. Morning and evening, every individual of my family was ordered always to be present; nor would I allow my apprentices to be absent on any account. In a few years the advantages of these engagements appeared manifestly conspicuous: the blessings of the upper and the nether springs followed me—health and happiness in my family, and prosperity in my business. At length such was my rapid increase in trade, and the necessity of devoting every possible moment to my customers, that I began to think whether family prayer did not occupy too much of our time in the morning. Pious scruples arose respecting my intention of relinquishing this part of my duty; but, at length, worldly interests prevailed so far as to induce me to excuse the attendance of my apprentices; and not long after, it was deemed advisable, for the more eager prosecution of our business, to make a prayer with my wife, when we arose in the morning, suffice for the day. Notwithstanding the repeated checks of conscience that followed this base omission, the calls of a flourishing concern, and the prospect of an increasing family, appeared so imperious and commanding, that I found an easy excuse for this fatal evil, especially as I did not omit prayer altogether. My conscience was now almost seared as with a hot iron; when it pleased the Lord to awaken me by a singular providence.

"One day I received a letter from a young man who had formerly been my apprentice, previous to my omitting family prayer. Not doubting but I continued domestic worship, his letter was chiefly on this subject. It was couched in the most affectionate and respectful terms; *but judge* of my surprise *and confusion*, when I read these words: 'Oh, my dear master, never, never shall I be able sufficiently to thank you for the precious privilege with which you indulged me in your family devotions: Oh, sir, eternity will be too short to praise my God for what I learnt there. It was there I first beheld my lost and wretched state as a sinner; it was there that I first knew the way of salvation; and there that I first experienced the preciousness of "Christ in me the hope of glory." Oh, sir! permit me to say, never, never neglect those precious engagements; you have yet a family and more apprentices: may your house be the birth-place of their souls.'—I could read no further; every line flashed condemnation in my face—I trembled—I shuddered—I

was alarmed at the thought, that the blood of my children and apprentices might soon be demanded at my hands!

"Filled with confusion, and bathed in tears, I fled for refuge in secret—I spread the letter before God—I agonized in prayer to him—but you can better conceive than I can describe my feelings; suffice it to say, that light broke in upon my disconsolate soul, and I obtained a sweet sense that there was mercy and pardon, even for such a wretch as I. I immediately drew my family around me, presented them before the Lord, and from that day to the present, I have never dared to omit family prayer. I am determined, through grace, that, whenever business becomes too large to permit family prayer, I will give up the superfluous part of my business, and retain my devotion. Better to lose a few shillings than become the deliberate murderer of my family, and the instrument of ruin to my own soul."

Extract from Abbot's Life.

COURAGE OF THE DEIST.

"It may *not* be amiss here to relate a narrative that I heard from a pious woman, concerning her brother. He was a young man that had openly and publicly professed deistical principles, asserting that there was no place of future punishment, or in other words, no hell. His conduct corresponded with his principles, and being possessed of a very handsome estate, he soon wasted his constitution by intemperance: finding it decaying very fast, he was advised to try the sea, in order to repair it again.—Accordingly, he took a passage with an old presbyterian captain, that kept up prayer on board, and with whom he often disputed the point, asserting that he firmly believed there was no hell, or place of future punishment. However, they had not been long at sea, before the Lord sent down a mighty tempest, as he did on Jonah: all human probability of surviving was taken away; the captain perceiving their imminent danger, began to exhort them to prepare to meet God, when to his great surprise, the first man that bawled out, was Mr. *No Heller*. The captain being a steady, firm man, turned to him, and said, What is the matter with you? I hope you are not afraid to die? I thought you told me that you verily believed there was *no hell*. Oh! said he, all bathed in tears, and wringing his hands, it will do well enough to talk about on land, but it will not do for a storm at sea! However, it pleased God to spare them, and to bring them all safe home again; and he, finding his health a little recovered, began to be ashamed of his testimony at sea, and soon fell into his former excesses again, which brought on his old complaints. He was reduced to a sick bed, and all hopes being gone, as to his recovery; he began to seek God in earnest, and the Lord in his infinite mercy spoke peace to his soul. He continued happy in his love, exhorting them that came in his way against all such diabolical principles. He departed this life in a transport of joy, and, I trust, rests where the wicked cease from troubling, and the weary shall for ever be at rest."

A NAME ABOVE EVERY NAME.

When the pious Bishop Beveridge was on his death bed, he did not

know any of his friends or connexions. A minister, with whom he had been well acquainted, visited him; and when conducted into his room he said, "Bishop Beveridge, do you know me?" "Who are you?" said the Bishop. Being told who the minister was, he said that he did not know him. Another friend came who had been equally well known, and accosted him in a similar manner—"Do you know *me*, Bishop Beveridge?" "Who are you," said he. Being told it was one of his intimate friends, he said, he did not know him. His *wife* then came to his bed-side, and asked him if he knew *her*. "Who are you?" said he. Being told she was his wife, he said he did not know *her*. "Well," said one, "Bishop Beveridge, do you know the Lord Jesus Christ?" "JESUS CHRIST," said he, reviving, as if the name had upon him the influence of a charm, "O! yes, I have known Him these forty years. Precious Saviour! HE IS MY ONLY HOPE!"

AFFLICTIONS.

Afflictions sent by Providence, melt the constancy of the noble mind, but confirm the obduracy of the vile. The same furnace that hardens clay, liquifies gold; and in the strong manifestations of divine power, Pharaoh found his punishment, but David his pardon.

From the Christian Observer.

ON DANCING.

ONE point remains, and I have done. Sorry I am to observe, that there are arising many gradations in the religious world; the result of a sort of fashion in religion. There are many, who, without being real Christians, wish to be thought so. Now many of these people indulge in companies and societies, in a style of living, and in plans of education for their children, which appear to be rather inconsistent with their profession. Such characters are very apt to shelter themselves, whenever it is possible, under the example of those who are considered as more religious than themselves. The children of such persons, in all probability, learn to dance; and if any question be made of its propriety, most readily they immediately quote the example of those, whose high character may exempt them from every suspicion of insincerity. Perhaps they may be persons who stand in the very first rank in the religious world, and whose piety it would be impossible to doubt. The argument would be deemed unanswerable; but what a difference there may be in the application? With *one* party, the accomplishment may prove really innocent; but what may it not prove with the other? It would be very easy to enlarge on this remark; but I trust the conclusion will be obvious to your readers.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN BIBLE SOCIETY.

THE number of languages in which the Holy Scriptures have been published by the British and Foreign Bible Society, or through its instrumentality, is now ONE HUNDRED AND FORTY-SEVEN: in *fifty-six* of which they had never been printed before. The total amount of issues in the British Isles, is 4,303,395 copies; and in other countries, sufficient to raise the

number to MORE THAN FIVE MILLIONS. The total amount of expenditures in carrying forward the various purposes of the society is SIX MILLIONS, THREE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-TWO THOUSAND, FIVE HUNDRED AND SIXTY DOLLARS. Yet after all these efforts, it is stated that the demand upon its services is rather increased than diminished!

APHORISMS.

The firmest friendships have been formed in mutual adversity, as iron is most strongly united by the fiercest flame.

Let those who would affect singularity with success, first determine to be very virtuous, and they will be sure to be very singular.

Good nature is more agreeable in conversation than wit, gives a certain air to the countenance which is more amiable than beauty. It shews virtue in the fairest light, takes off in some measure from the deformity of vice, and makes even folly and impertinence supportable.

Review.

For the Christian Magazine.

REVIEW OF TRACTS *published by the American Unitarian Association.*

[Concluded from page 288.]

THE tenth Tract in the series is entitled, "Remarks on a Popular Error respecting the Lord's Supper, by F. W. P. Greenwood." The error remarked upon, is substantially this—persons consider themselves in a measure free from the obligations of religion, until by an open profession of it, and by partaking of the Lord's Supper, these obligations are voluntarily assumed. Consequently all who wish for the present to be unembarrassed with obligations of this nature, the mirthful, the fashionable, the worldly, and the scrupulous, very wisely, as they judge, conclude to defer a profession of their faith.

The error here spoken of (for an error undoubtedly it is) we think not uncommon, perhaps in every religious denomination. Persons seem to regard communion at the Lord's table, and the other duties which stand connected with it, as a kind of free will offering, which they may make, or not, as they think good. If they consent by an open profession, they are bound; but if not, they are not bound. The consequence is, that very many live quite easy in a neglect of the most important duties—in a life of irreligion if not immorality, on the ground that they have never taken upon themselves the obligations of Christians.

Mr. G. refutes this error very properly and successfully, by showing that our religious obligations are not of a nature to be taken up and laid aside at pleasure. They were imposed upon us at the commencement of our moral existence by the Author of our being. They are the result of the most necessary relations subsisting between ourselves and him. They bind "with the ada-

mantine strength of condition and necessity."

"It would be as proper," says he, "for a son to declare that he would not fulfil every filial obligation to his parents, till he appeared in court and took a legal oath that he would do so, as for the native of a christian land to declare that there were duties to his Maker which he did not intend, nor was he required to discharge, till he had openly allowed them; and the son, after having taken such an oath, might talk as consistently about his *new* obligations, as might the Christian, after the promise was passed, about his. They were both of them born with obligations, which neither of them can dismiss nor change; they might as well dismiss the air which they inhaled with their first breath, and throw off the atmosphere which envelopes the world."

But if a profession of religion brings with it no new duties, then what advantage hath it? What are its benefits? And why may it not, as a useless formality, be laid aside? To these questions, a very satisfactory answer may be given, though none is given in the Tract. The benefit of a profession of religion is, not that it imposes new duties—duties which were not previously binding, but that it furnishes additional *inducements* to the faithful performance of duty. It increases, in a sense, our *obligations* to be faithful; since, to all previous obligation, it superadds that arising from our own voluntary recognition and engagement. This benefit of a religious profession, and of stated communion at the Lord's table, is very obvious and great, and is one of which every considerate Christian will wish to avail himself. Sensible of his own exposure and weakness, he will wish to furnish himself with every inducement—to arm himself with all possible resolution, to be devoted and faithful in the service of that Being whom he supremely loves.

The subject of this Tract is interesting and important, and we are not certain that our sentiments differ at all from those of Mr. G. respecting it; though doubtless we might have expressed them in somewhat different language. Were the subject enlarged, so as to include the *terms* of communion—what does, and what does not, *disqualify* for a proper partaking of the holy supper, we can foresee, from what is here incidentally dropped, that our regions of thought might be wide asunder. For instance, in addressing those who "like to be gay, gay in spirit, and gay in external appearance; who are passionately fond of dancing; who delight in going to splendid entertainments, and in splendidly entertaining their friends in return;" Mr. G. "presumes not to say that the way of life which they love is not innocent," or that it unfits them for communion with Christ at his table. (p. 7.) We think we *should* presume to ask persons of this *description*, whether they had ever read such scriptures as these, "Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world; if any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him." "Be not conformed to this evil world, but be ye transformed by the renewing of your minds." "The friendship of the world is enmity with God; whosoever therefore will be a friend of this world is the enemy of God." "Walk circumspectly, not as fools, but as wise, redeeming the time, because the days are evil." "Abstain from all appearance of evil." "Rejoice, O young man, in thy youth, and let thy heart cheer thee in the days of thy youth, and walk in the ways of thine heart, and in the sight of thine eyes; but know thou, that for all these things God

will bring thee into judgment."* We might presume to inquire of them, whether they were not "lovers of pleasure, more than lovers of God," and whether they must not experience an entire change of moral feeling, before they were prepared for communion with Christ, in private or in public, in this world or the future.

But notwithstanding some exceptions, we regard this Tract as a very respectable publication. It is short, but full, coming directly to the subject of which it treats, and disposing of it in as few words as possible. The style, if not the most forcible, is neat and perspicuous, and the whole is fitted to leave a favorable impression. We should gladly see it in the hands of many in our congregations, who are quietly neglecting important religious duties, on the mere ground that they have not *covenanted* to perform them;—just as though God had left it for us to say, not whether we should serve him or no, but whether we should be under *moral obligation* to serve him—whether we could neglect his service, and be guiltless.

We have now gone through with those Tracts, the titles of which were announced at the commencement of this Review. Since writing our first number, *another* Tract has made its appearance, to which, in conclusion, the attention of our readers is solicted. Its title is "Unitarianism vindicated against the charge of not going far enough." Says the writer in his first sentence, "When all other objections to Unitarianism fail, it is common for opponents to say, that this system is very well as far as it goes, but it does not go far enough." "When all *other* objections to Unitarianism fail;"—there are *other* objections then, besides the one here under consideration. But says this same writer, in his last sentence, "Thus do we answer the objection, that Unitarians do not go far enough; and, as this objection virtually includes *every other*," &c. This objection is here made to include *every other;* and consequently there can be no objection to Unitarianism separate from this.—Before the Tract goes to another edition, we hope the writer will bring his first and last sentences together, and inform us which of them he would have us believe. For ourselves, we really think there may be other objections, besides the one which he has undertaken to refute. We think Unitarianism may lie open to the charge, not only of "not going far enough," but of not being "very well as far as it goes;" so that if our author succeeds in removing the former objection, the latter may still remain, and the controversy may not be at an end.

In his attempts to vindicate his religious system "against the charge of not going far enough," the writer undertakes to prove, "that it goes far enough for *scripture;* far enough for *safety;* and far enough for *moral effect.*" It goes far enough for scripture, he says, in the views it inculcates "of the *person* and *authority* of Jesus Christ; of the *honor* due to him; and of the *reconciliation* or *atonement* he has effected."(p. 4.) But in his endeavors to show this, by comparing his system, in its bearing on these great and interesting subjects, with that inculcated in the scriptures, the scriptures are very unfairly treated. They are not fully or impartially

* 1 John, ii. 15. Rom. xii. 2. James, iv. 4. Eph. v. 15. 1 Thes. v. 22. Ec. xi. 9.

consulted, and consequently are made to hold forth a sentiment, which they never were intended to convey. A class of passages is introduced, which, taken separately, may seem to favor Unitarian views, to the total neglect of another class, with which these should be compared, and by which they should be qualified; and then, without ceremony, the conclusion is drawn, that Unitarianism goes as far as the scriptures, and is, in fact, the religion of the Bible. But this is not treating the subject fairly. This is not fearlessly walking with the Unitarian doctrine through the whole length and breadth of scripture, to see whether they agree or not. We know there are passages, those for instance which speak of Christ as inferior to the Father and dependent on him, which are equally consistent with the views of Trinitarians and Unitarians respecting his person: For Trinitarians believe that Christ was, in a sense, inferior to the Father, and dependent on him. But in determining whether Unitarianism goes as far as the scriptures, there are other passages to be taken into the account. Christ is spoken of in the scriptures as "JEHOVAH our righteousness." He is spoken of as "the MIGHTY GOD, the everlasting Father, the Prince of peace." He "is GOD OVER ALL blessed forever." He "is the TRUE GOD and everlasting life." Saith the Father to the Son, "thy throne, O GOD, is forever and ever; the sceptre of thy kingdom is a right sceptre." "*By him were all things created*, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; *all things were created by him*, and *for him*; and he is before all things, and *by him all things consist*."* No one can doubt that these and similar passages are in the Bible, and that they are the actual representation of the Bible, in regard to the personal glory of the Saviour. Unitarians can determine for themselves, whether their scheme carries them as far as this. If it does, it carries them, on this point, far enough for scripture; if not, it is fearfully, infinitely deficient.

There are passages, relating to some of the duties which we owe to the Father, which harmonize equally with the views of Trinitarians and Unitarians; since we all agree that the Father is a proper object of religious worship, and the person to be more commonly addressed in prayer. But there are other passages, in which the *Son* is unequivocally represented as entitled to the worship of his saints. He was often worshipped during his abode on earth, and under circumstances which forbid the idea that a mere civil obeisance was intended. Stephen died upon his knees, while in the act of praying to his Saviour. Nearly all the epistles of Paul conclude with an ejaculatory prayer to the Lord Jesus. But to put the question of his title to religious worship beyond all dispute, the heavens were opened to the beloved John, and he heard the whole celestial choir offering their praises and adorations to the Son of God. He saw "the four beasts, and the four and twenty elders, fall down before the *Lamb*, having every one of them harps, and golden vials full of odors, which are the *prayers of saints*." He heard "ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands,

* Jer. xxiii. 6. Isa. ix. 6. Rom. ix. 5. 1 John, v. 20. Heb. i. 8. Col. i. 16.

saying with a loud voice, *Worthy is the Lamb that was slain.*" He heard every creature, in heaven and on earth, saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth on the throne, and to the *Lamb*, forever and ever." (See Rev. v. 8—13.) The scriptures then *do warrant* the offering of religious worship to the Saviour. Does Unitarianism warrant the same? If so, it goes as far, on this subject, as the scriptures. But if not, it falls infinitely short of the scriptures, in the honors which it ascribes to the Son of God.

We could better tell whether Unitarianism goes as far as the scriptures, in the views it inculcates respecting the death of Christ, if we knew precisely what these views were. "We look upon the death of Christ," says the writer of the Tract, "as the means by which he was made perfect; as affording a signal attestation to his sincerity; and as important and necessary for *other moral uses.*" (p. 7.) But *for what other moral uses*, we are not informed. "We believe," says he on one page, "that this voluntary sacrifice of Christ may have had a *direct influence on God in favor of mankind.*" (p. 7.) But in contradiction to this, we are told on the next page, that "the sufferings of Christ are part of the means of reconciling us to God, but *not of reconciling God to us.*" (p. 8.) Amidst all this uncertainty and contradiction, it is easy to see, however, that the great object of Christ's death, as set forth in the scriptures, is kept entirely out of sight. There is nothing said of his being "wounded for our transgressions, and bruised for our iniquities"—of his making his life a ransom, a propitiation, a sacrifice for sinners—or of his "bearing our sins in his own body on the tree." There is nothing said of his "giving himself for our sins"—"suffering for our sins"—"purging our sins"—"dying for our sins"—or shedding his blood "for the remission of sins." Accordingly there is nothing said, of our being "forgiven for Christ's sake," of our being "justified by his blood," "purchased with his blood," "redeemed by his blood," and "washed from our sins in his own blood."—There is no uncertainty or contradiction in the scriptures, respecting the great object of the Saviour's death. He died to make atonement for the sins of men. He died to open a way, in which "God could be just, and yet the justifier of him who believeth in Jesus." He died to lay a strong foundation, on which pardon could be freely dispensed to penitent, returning sinners. This is clearly the view, which Isaiah, and Paul, and Peter, and John, and which indeed Christ himself entertained, respecting the leading object of his death. Do Unitarians entertain the same? If so, they go as far as the scriptures on this fundamental subject. If not, they are chargeable with a deficiency, for which nothing can compensate.

We cordially unite with the writer of this Tract in saying, "To the law, and to the testimony." We hold the scriptures to be an authority, from which there is no appeal, and the standard by which all our speculations are to be tried. But let those who thus confidently appeal to the scriptures be willing to travel through the scriptures, and measure their system by the whole length and breadth of this unerring rule.—In view of the remarks which have been made,

we leave it to the decision of all impartial readers—we could almost leave it to Unitarians themselves—whether their scheme does not fall fearfully short of this rule, even in those points, on which they have themselves chosen that the comparison should be made. The scriptures represent the Lord Jesus Christ as "God," "the mighty God," "the true God," the "God over all;" but Unitarianism represents him as something infinitely less. The scriptures represent him as a proper object of religious worship, and as actually receiving the solemn worship of saints on earth, and of glorified beings in heaven; but Unitarianism denies him this worship. The scriptures represent him as laying the only foundation in his blood, for the pardon of penitent, returning sinners. "Other foundation can no man lay, than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." But Unitarians say, they "would resort to the less chilling creed of the Atheist, rather than admit" the doctrine of atonement by the blood of Christ. These, it will be recollected, are the three points, in relation to which the writer of the Tract proposes to show, that Unitarianism goes as far as the scriptures. But who, that has any tolerable acquaintance with the scriptures, can avoid seeing that he has utterly failed? Unitarianism and the Scriptures! There is such a palpable discrepancy between them—such a defection, a falling off, of the former from the latter, that if the one is true, the other cannot be! If the one is a revelation from God, the other, in all its distinguishing features, is clearly an invention of the world!

Our author's second attempt is to show that "Unitarianism goes far enough *for safety*." Under this head, he has various wise remarks respecting the comparative danger of believing too much, and too little; and respecting the comparative guilt of refusing divine honors to the Saviour, on supposition he is God, and of worshipping him, on supposition he is not. He considers the conduct of those (if those there be) who pretend to be Calvinists, because, on Unitarian principles, the Calvinist may be saved, while, on Calvinistic principles, the Unitarian cannot be saved; and he endeavors to allay the fears of some, who think "the tendency of making any retrenchments on the popular faith, is to downright infidelity."

We design not to follow him, in his remarks on these subjects, not because they contain nothing objectionable, or what it might be difficult to refute; but because we think them of very little consequence, especially in their bearing on the point in question. The point to be proved is, that "Unitarianism goes far enough *for safety;*" or that the *soul of the Unitarian is safe.* But who does not see, that this proposition rests entirely upon the one already discussed? What do we know of the terms of salvation, or the qualifications for heaven, any farther than these are disclosed in the scriptures? If "Unitarianism goes far enough for scripture," then doubtless it "goes far enough for safety." But if it falls essentially short of the scriptures, no person should be induced to rest his soul upon it. Hence, we are thrown directly back upon the ground of scripture—the ground over which we have already passed. And we do think we have shown—incontestably shown—that Unitarianism falls

short of the religion of the Bible, in the most essential particulars. It makes *us*, in our natural state, very different beings from what the Bible represents us. It proposes a Saviour infinitely inferior to the one exhibited in the scriptures. It forbids that worship, which inspired men of old, and which saints and angels in heaven, have felt constrained to offer to the Son of God. But, above all, it takes away the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ—the only foundation of hope to the ruined sinner, directing him to seek forgiveness in some other way, than through the atoning blood of Jesus. A system so essentially defective, as well as erroneous, and coming so fearfully short of the Bible; how can it be safe? Denying the native guilt and ruin of man, his need of an almighty Saviour, and the fact that such a Saviour has appeared, and shed his blood for the remission of sins; how can it be safe? We judge not those who have embraced this system. We hope they may be better, in some instances, than a consistent adherance to their avowed principles would render them. But how can we think them renewed in the temper of their minds, when they deny that such a change is ordinarily needed or experienced? How can we think them washed in the blood of Christ, when they do not feel that they are naturally polluted, and do not believe that the blood of Christ was shed, or is ever applied, for the cleansing of the soul? We do not judge them; but if any of this class are in a safe condition for eternity, it must be, not because their system is safe, but because their characters have been formed under the influence of a better system. If any of them are pious, their piety must be sustained, not by the principles which they have embraced, but in spite of them.

The writer of the Tract endeavors to show, in the third and last place, that "Unitarianism goes far enough for *moral effect*." In urging this, he admits, that the faith of the Unitarian "has fewer objects" than that of the Calvinist; but he supposes that these few embrace all those great principles, which are of any considerable practical power. But here again we must be allowed to think differently. As it seems to us, it is those great doctrines of religion which the Unitarian rejects, which give to the Bible its amazing power—which render it "like the fire and hammer, which break the rock in pieces." The doctrine of total depravity, clearly stated and closely urged, is that which awakens the slumbering conscience, and revives an affecting sense of sin. The doctrines of Christ's divinity, incarnation, and atoning blood, though "to the Jews a stumbling block, and to the Greeks foolishness"—though rejected and despised by the "reasoning pride" of man—are still, in a pre-eminent degree, "the power of God, and the wisdom of God." It is because our divine Saviour was "in the form of God, and thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men, and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross"—it is because we regard him in this light, that we feel the influence of his bleeding love, constraining us to love him, follow him, and devote ourselves to him—constraining us to "live no

longer unto ourselves, but to him who died for us, and rose again." The doctrine of justification by faith alone, is fitted to abase our pride, to remove all ground of self-confidence and boasting, and brings us to a sole and simple reliance upon the sufficiency of our Saviour. And to particularize no farther; the future and eternal punishment of the wicked is a doctrine of great power, alarming the fears of the careless and profane, and exciting them to flee from the wrath to come. Take away these and the kindred doctrines, which the Unitarian rejects, and the Bible is, in a manner, neutralized. Its edge is blunted; its solemn interest has departed; its renovating power is gone. It no longer pricks the sinner to the heart; stops him in his career of guilt; and induces the agonizing cry, "Men and brethren, what shall I do?" Bereft of those doctrines which have been mentioned, the Gospel (if it be not a misnomer to call it Gospel) becomes cold and powerless, fitted rather to quiet the conscience than to arouse it, and to satisfy men with a worldly decency of external behaviour, in place of the warm and vigorous devotion of the heart.

These conclusions, formed *a priori*, are abundantly justified by facts. The decisions of Dr. Priestly, as to the superior religious character of Orthodox believers generally, and of Dr. Chalmers, as to the comparative efficacy of Orthodox and Unitarian preaching, as verified in his own experience, have been given in the preceding pages, (see pp. 158 and 250.) It is admitted also in the Tract before us, as "a remark often made," that "the characters formed under Trinitarian impressions are more strict, serious, and devout, than those formed under Unitarian impressions." (p. 22.)

The writer of this Tract observes that "in many characters, formed under Calvinistic impressions, there is a certain *severity* and *extravagance*, from which every one must wish them free. This remark he applies particularly to Orthodox females, comparing them to Queen Mary, of whom it was said, "that she was a good tempered lady, of an ill tempered religion."—If we understand this comparison, intended doubtless as a compliment for our Orthodox sisters, and which it cost the author apparently no little trouble to present, the meaning is this, "They are very good tempered, but their religion is ill tempered. Consequently *they are better than their religion.*" But if this is his meaning, he may rest assured, that Orthodox females can receive no such compliment from him. They *good* tempered, but *their religion ill* tempered! They better than their religion! The idea will shock them, and fill them with horror! It is their daily lamentation before God in secret, that they come so far short of their holy religion, in strictness, in purity, in devotedness, in every thing. Their religion is to them the high standard of perfection, comprizing all that is "fair, and lovely, and of good report;" and while they know that they are very far from having yet attained, or from being already perfect, like the great Apostle, they "forget those things which are behind, and reach forth unto those which are before, and press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus."

We conclude this review, which has been protracted far beyond

the limits originaly prescribed, with two general remarks; the first relating to the manner in which it has been conducted; and the second, to the importance of the questions at issue between us. —We offer no apology for what we have written, on the ground of its having been prepared in haste, and amidst almost numberless interruptions; for, though an apology of this nature could never be made probably with more justice, with intellgent readers it would not, and we soberly think should not, excuse palpable failures, in point of execution.—In remarking upon the publications which have been before us, we have practised nothing like disguise or reserve. We have expressed our sentiments with frankness and confidence, feeling strongly supported by the scriptures, and by a consciousness of the goodness of our cause. We have spoken always plainly, and sometimes, it will be thought perhaps, unguardedly; but have not intended to treat our Unitarian neighbors with undue severity, or their publications with unfairness. We have freely awarded commendation, where we felt that it was due, and have as freely controverted and even censured, where truth and a good conscience seemed to require it.

The questions at issue between us and Unitarians are certainly of very great and solemn moment. Unlike some which are agitated on the subject of religion, these take hold upon the essentials of the Gospel—upon the vital interests of the soul. They respect the Supreme Being, the great object of love, of worship, of confidence, of joy, to all dutiful creatures throughout the universe. They respect the natural character and condition of man, and his necessity of a radical change in his moral affections, in order to see the kingdom of God. They respect the personal dignity and glory of the Saviour; the object for which he came into the world; and the nature of the work which he here accomplished. They respect the foundation of the sinner's hope, the one party laying it in the atoning blood of Christ, and the other in the merits of the creature, or in the unsatisfied mercy of the Creator. They reach even to the future world, and respect the degree and duration of that fearful punishment which awaits the wicked beyond the grave. If questions such as these are trifles, all religion must be a trifle. The immortal soul, on this gound, is a trifle, and salvation and damnation are words without meaning. Let all then feel, when they reflect on this controversy, that it is a great one, a solemn one, one in which each for himself has a deep, an awful, a personal concern. And let all those consider, who are called in providence to take a stand respecting it one way or the other, that their determination involves interests lasting as eternity, and precious as the undying soul.

Ordinations and Installations.

Aug. 22,—Rev. J. H. MARTIN was ordained at Hanover, Ms. as an Evangelist, by Plymouth North Association. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Colburn, of Abington.

Sept. 6,—Mr. AMASA CLARK, was ordained as an Evangelist, in Russell, Ms. by the Westfield Baptist Association.

Sept. 6,—Rev. JOHN T. BALDWIN, was ordained as an Evangelist, at Springville, N. Y. by the Presbytery of Buffalo.

Sept. 12,—Rev. GEORGE COWLES was installed Pastor of the Second Congregational Church and Society in Danvers, Ms. Sermon by Rev. Dr. Woods of Andover.

Sept. 12,—Rev. JARED CURTIS, Chaplain of the State Prison at Auburn, N. Y. was ordained as an Evangelist, at Stockbridge, Ms. in compliance with the wishes of the Managers of the Prison Discipline Society. Sermon by Rev. D. D. Field.

Poetry.

From a London Magazine.

A BROTHER BORN TO ADVERSITY.

WHEN ev'ry scene, this side the grave,
Seems dark and cheerless to the eye,
How sweet at such an hour to have
A brother in adversity!

When father, mother, all are gone,—
When bursts affection's closest tie,—
How sweet to claim, as still our own,
A brother in adversity!

When frowns an angry world unkind,
And hope's delusive visions fly,
How sweet in such an hour to find
A brother in adversity!

And who is this whom still we find,
When father, mother, husband, die,
Still faithful, tender, loving, kind?
A brother in adversity!

Jesus! my Lord! ah, who can trace
Thy love unchanging, full, and free;
Or tell the riches of thy grace,
Thou brother in adversity!

Ye trav'llers in this wilderness,
Who somewhat of his beauty see:
Forever, oh! forever bless
This brother in adversity!

ANON.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

"Juvenis" is received, and "F. C. R.," upon the subject of submission. As we consider the leading principles in relation to this subject already sufficiently discussed in our work, and as we have inserted two pieces on each side of the question, we think it best to decline the insertion of any thing further upon the subject for the present. Two pieces on each side of a controversy, are as many as can, generally, be admitted. We wish it to be understood, that our work is open to controversy, and that we shall indulge our correspondents to as great an extent as, in our judgment, will be admissible.

THE

CHRISTIAN MAGAZINE.

VOL. IV. NOVEMBER, 1827. No. 11.

For the Christian Magazine.

ARGUMENT OF THE UNIVERSALISTS FROM REV. V. 13, CONSIDERED.

And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, forever and ever.

[Concluded from page 306.]

BUT it may be said, that to suppose every creature here means every *holy* creature only, is an unauthorised restriction of the passage. To this I reply,

4. There are various passages of scripture in which the word *every* is used, when it *cannot* mean every *individual* of the whole. No one can suppose that the Apostles and first preachers of christianity, went to every town and village throughout the whole world. But Mark says of the eleven Apostles, "They went forth and preached *every where*, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following." The language which Luke uses upon this subject is not less universal. "And they departed, and went through the towns, preaching the gospel and healing *every where*." The same writer, speaking of those who were dispersed by the persecution of Saul, says, they that were scattered abroad, went *every where* preaching the word. Now it must be obvious, that the meaning of the sacred writers in these passages, can be no more than this, the Apostles and first teachers of christianity, went preaching the gospel to every place to which they could have access, and which they had time and opportunity of visiting. And this it may be presumed, from the nature of the case, was not one half of the particular places in the whole world; and probably not one half of the particular places which were known in their day. But the expressions used respecting them by the sacred writers, being agreeable to the common forms of speech, are not misunderstood. The nature of the case suggests to every considerate reader the necessary limitation which they must have. So when the Apostle John says, "Every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, heard I saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, forever and ever," the nature of the case evidently limits the expression, not only to intelligent creatures, but to holy creatures

Especially will this be the case, when it is considered that he was speaking of holy beings, and that at the time when the event of the Apostle's vision took place, his language could not be true of one half of mankind. If there were some places to which the Apostle's did not go, preaching the Gospel, notwithstanding it is said in general terms they went *every where*, then it is possible, that there were some whom the Apostle did not hear praising and giving glory to Christ; although it is said, in general terms, he heard every creature.

But perhaps some may think that the expression *every where*, is not so strong as *every creature*, and that therefore it is improper to limit the one, after the manner in which the other is found to be limited. I can, however, see no other difference than this; the one respects a place, and the other a person; and if there can be as many places as there are persons, the one must be as particular as the other. But there is no occasion for reasoning on this subject. There is a passage in which the expression *every creature*, is clearly used in a limited sense. And it is used too for the same purpose, with regard to the same subject, and expresses precisely the same meaning with *every where*, in the passages which have been quoted. "If," says Paul to the Colossians, "ye continue in the faith, grounded and settled, and be not moved away from the hope of the Gospel, which ye have heard, and *which was preached to every creature which is under heaven;* whereof I Paul am made a minister." Now no person will deny that this expression, *every creature under heaven*, is as strong as that which is used in the passage we are considering. But we cannot, without admitting what we know was false, understand it to mean every *individual* of the human race; for the Gospel had not then reached every individual. This is saying, in general terms, that the Gospel was preached in the Apostle's days to every individual, and in every place, to which they could have access, and which they had time, and opportunity, to visit. And this we have seen is consistent with the fact that many individuals in their day did not hear it. Now if we are only allowed to understand the passage before us as we do these, with the restrictions which the nature of the case evidently render necessary, it teaches us no more than that the Apostle heard all the inhabitants of heaven, and all the *saints* on earth, praising and giving glory to God and the Lamb. That we have a right, indeed that we ought to understand this passage in this restricted sense, *will be, if* possible, still more *evident, if* we consider,

5. That an unrestricted interpretation of them will make this apostle contradict himself. Let us now for a moment suppose that this passage is to be understood in the most particular and unlimited sense, and that, as has been contended by the advocates for the salvation of all men, it is descriptive of the state of things "at the completion of the scheme of God on earth," and see if such a construction does not contradict what this same apostle has taught in the same book. It will not, I trust, after what has been said, be doubted, that the vision of which these words are descriptive, respects the worship paid to Christ when he appeared to open the seals of the book from which the revelations of John were made.

Consequently this construction of the words, will compel us to adopt the principle that the opening of the first seal is at the end of this world, and that all the events which are brought to view by the seven seals as they opened one after another, respect *futurity*, and of course, on the principles of the Universalists, a period of duration when all men are holy and happy. Now if my readers will only turn to the book, and examine the events as they are revealed at the opening of the several seals, they will find that, so far from representing all mankind as holy and happy, they present a most gloomy picture of sin and wretchedness. To show the truth of this remark, I here give the words of John respecting the opening of the sixth seal. "And I beheld when he had opened the sixth seal, and lo, there was a great earthquake; and the sun became black as sackcloth of hair, and the moon became as blood: and the stars of heaven fell upon the earth, even as a fig-tree casteth her untimely figs, when she is shaken of a mighty wind. And the heaven departed as a scroll when it is rolled together; and every mountain and island were moved out of their places. And the kings of the earth, and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief captains, and the mighty men, and every bond-man, and every free-man, hid themselves in the dens and in the rocks of the mountains; and said to the mountains and rocks, Fall on us, and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb: for the great day of his wrath is come; and who shall be able to stand?" Now the events here predicted, are *after* the event described in the passage before us. It matters not, as it respects the object which I have now in view, whether they be considered as belonging to this world or the next, they are clearly *after* the event described by these words. To suppose, therefore, that they are descriptive of a state, when a complete end is made of all sin and misery, is to make one vision of the apostle John, contradict the other.

The construction given to this passage by those who make it an argument in favor of the salvation of all men, is inconsistent with the obvious construction of several other passages contained in the writings of this same apostle. Consider every creature, as meaning every individual of our race, and infer from the passage that they will all eventually be holy and happy, and see if this construction does not flatly contradict the following declaration of the same apostle. "And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away; and there was found no place for them. And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them: and they were judged every man according to their works. And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire." That the punishment here denoted by a l

of fire, is the final punishment of the wicked, endless in its duration, and totally inconsistent with their ultimate restoration, will be evident to all, who consider that in other passages of the same apostle it is said to endure forever. For instance, it is said of those who worship the beast and his image, that they "shall be tormented with fire and brimstone,—and that the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever."

6. To suppose that by every creature, is meant every *individual* creature, is to make the Apostle not only contradict himself, but the other Apostles. As there must be a perfect harmony between the writings of one Apostle, and another, on the supposition that they were divinely inspired, we must, if we would interpret them according to truth, put a construction upon the words of each, which is both consistent with himself and with all the others. But that construction of the passage before us, which makes it favor the salvation of all, is evidently contradictory to the plain and obvious meaning of various passages found in the writings of the other Apostles. I have not time to quote them all, but permit me to invite your attention for a moment to the following. "Know ye not," says Paul to the Corinthians, "that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived, neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God." Now if the time is coming when every individual will be holy and happy, as those believe who give the most unlimited construction to the passage we are considering, the unrighteous, fornicators, revilers, and drunkards, will all inherit the kingdom of God; for there are certainly multitudes who die in these sins. This construction of the passage contradicts also the plain and obvious import of the *following* declaration of Paul—"The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven, with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power."

To make this passage teach the doctrine of universal salvation, is to make it contradict the words of Jude, as well as those of John and Paul. "And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day. Even as Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire. Likewise also these filthy dreamers defile the flesh, despise dominion, and speak evil of dignities.—These are spots in your feasts of charity, &c.—to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness forever."

7. To suppose that every creature, in this passage, means every *individual* creature, and consequently, that all men will in the end be holy and happy, is to make the Apostle John contradict the plain declarations of *Christ*, as well as the Apostles. It contradicts the declaration of Christ

respecting the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost. "Wherefore, I say unto you, all manner of sin, and blasphemy, shall be forgiven unto men; but the blasphemy of the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, nor the world to come." The parallel passage in Mark, reads thus, "He that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation."

The following representation of the day of judgment, and its transactions, given us by Christ, is directly contradicted by that interpretation of the passage, which makes it speak in favor of universal salvation. "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all nations. And he shall separate them one from another as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats: and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, and the goats on the left. Then shall the king say to them on his right hand, come ye blessed of my father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. Then shall he say to them on his left hand, Depart ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels. And these shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal."

8. To interpret this passage so as to make it favor the salvation of all men, is to render it inconsistent with numerous facts and remarks interspered throughout the Bible. It is inconsistent with the contrast, which the Bible uniformly makes between the future condition of the righteous and the wicked. It is inconsistent with all those passages, which specify certain conditions, without which sinners cannot be saved. Such, for instance, as the following. "Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven." "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life, and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life." "Except ye repent ye shall all likewise perish."

It is inconsistent with the fact, which Christ has asserted, that many are walking the broad way which leads to destruction, and few in the narrow way that leads to life.

It is inconsistent with the fact, asserted by Christ, that it would have been good for Judas if he had never been born.

It is inconsistent with the fact, which Christ has taught us in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, that there is no passing from hell to heaven. "Besides this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed, that they who would pass from them to you cannot; neither can they pass to us who would come from thence."

It is inconsistent with the fact, of which Christ so often reminds us, that we are in danger of losing our souls. "What shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul, or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?"

Now it will be perceived by every reader, that the scriptures,

rightly interpreted, must agree with themselves, and of course that the construction of a passage, which makes it clash with so many others must be false. ***

Extract from Flavel's works.

Part of "a Familiar Conference between a Minister and a doubting Christian, concerning the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper."

Minister. You know I told you, that a man may be a true Christian, and yet may not be fit to partake of this holy ordinance: because he may believe unto salvation, and yet be so ignorant of this mystery, as not to be able to make a due application of it to his own soul.

Christian. Ah, sir, I would willingly be informed what is necessary to be done by a sound believer, in order to the partaking of this blessed ordinance.

Min. First, he must consider, that the elements and matter of this ordinance are not common bread and wine after consecration, but set apart to holy use, and so to be received with holy understanding and fear. And, therefore, the Corinthians were blamed by the Apostle for their ignorance and irreverence. 1 Cor. xi. Again, that these elements, so blessed and set apart by Christ's appointment, do represent a crucified Redeemer, and we are to partake of them with love, as a memorial of his death; and with faith, as the seal of the promise, and the means appointed by God to convey the benefits of Christ crucified to the soul.

Ch. Sir, these considerations raise up my desires to come to the Lord's table, which I hope to be a partaker of with the same sentiments, that you have now laid before me, and that I shall feast my eyes on that lovely object, which is so full of love, and that my eye will so deeply affect my heart toward my Redeemer, that I may meet with my blessed Lord in all the ways of his appointment.

Min. Again, you ought to set your soul upon self-examination, that so you may be sensible of your wants and defects; and come to Christ for a supply of the graces of his Holy Spirit, that you may exercise faith, love, repentance, and all other graces, with such warmth and vigor, that Jesus Christ may delight in you, and you in him, and there may be a mutual and joyful renewing of your covenant of love and obedience to your blessed Saviour.

Ch. But it is usually said, that the holy sacrament is a quickening, cherishing, comforting, and confirming ordinance.

Min. No doubt but the worthy, prepared receivers of this blessed banquet have, by a due participation, found their love inflamed, their faith strengthened, their obedience confirmed, their humility increased, so that they have appeared vile in their own sight, and have had an utter detestation of all sin, and an earnest expectation and desire after the glorious appearance of their blessed Lord and Redeemer.

Ch. Sir, since the benefits and blessings are so great, it makes me the more earnestly long to be a communicant in these blessed mysteries.

Min. It is the duty of all Christ's ministers to give the sacramental bread of life, and the cup of consolation, to those, who hunger and thirst after Jesus Christ, and his righteousness and kingdom. And now I have told you your

duty, I shall be willing to declare to you the nature and circumstances of this blessed ordinance.

Ch. Sir, I must confess, I am not so well instructed herein; and, if I may not be too troublesome, would be very glad to understand what this holy ordinance is, and why it is called a Sacrament.

Min. It is a seal of the covenant of God in *Christ*, wherein, by certain outward signs instituted by our Saviour, *Christ* with all his benefits are signified, conveyed, and sealed to the worthy receiver. The word *sacrament*, hath been anciently used, both to signify Baptism and the Supper of the Lord, and was taken up by the ancient fathers, from the oath, by which the Roman soldiers were sworn to their duty, and were not admitted to be soldiers, till they had solemnly taken that oath or sacrament.

Ch. Pray, sir, how many sacraments were instituted under the New Testament, and by whose authority were they appointed?

Min. There are only two; Baptism, and the Lord's Supper; and they were ordained by the sole and immediate authority of Jesus Christ.

Ch. What are the elements to be used in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper?

Min. Bread and wine, and no other; Luke, xxii. 19, 20. And all communicants are to receive both of them, notwithstanding the bold, sacrilegious practice of the papists, who give the *people* the bread or wafer only, none but the *priest* receiving both the bread and wine.

Ch. May not the bread and wine at our tables signify the same thing?

Min. No, because this is solemnly set apart, and consecrated to sacramental use, by prayer and blessing, and by applying the words of our dear Redeemer in the institution of this ordinance.

Ch. What are the benefits, that Christ gives, and we receive in this ordinance?

Min. The exercise and increase of every grace, the cleansing of our souls from the guilt of sin; healing the wounds, which sin hath made in our consciences; a confirmation of the truth and promises of God; an humble and holy delight in Christ and our fellow-christians; and a more earnest longing for, and expectation of, the blessedness of the life to come. And it is an ordinance chiefly intended for the confirmation of our faith, love, and increase in grace, so that no person ought to come thereunto but in faith.

Ch. Sir, there is one Scripture, that, I believe, discourages many from partaking of the Lord's table; neither do I, indeed, well understand it; 1 Cor. xi. 27, 28, 29. "Whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup. For, he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body."

Min. I am, indeed, of the opinion, that the want of a right understanding of this Scripture has been a stumbling-block to many, and so I shall endeavor briefly to explain it. The apostle here truly represents and very much aggravates the danger of unworthily receiving this holy sacrament; but he does not deter the *Corinthians* from it, because they

had sometimes come to it without due reverence, but exhorts them to amend what had been amiss, and to come better prepared and disposed for the future, and, therefore, after that terrible denunciation, "Whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily," &c. he does not add, therefore let *Christians* take heed of coming to the Lord's table, but let them come prepared and with due reverence, not as to a common meal, but to a solemn participation of the body and blood of Christ; "But let him examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup." For, if this be a good reason to abstain from this ordinance, for fear of performing it in an undue manner, then a wicked man may as well lay aside all other holy duties, as prayer, hearing and reading the word of God, for fear of the unworthy use of them; since, "The prayer of the wicked is an abomination to the Lord;" and Christ says, "Take heed how ye hear;" and the apostle says, that to those, who will not believe the Gospel, it is the savour of death to them,—that is, it is deadly and damnable to them. Now, there is as much reason for men to give over praying or attending on the word of God, as not to receive the sacrament, since he, that prays unworthily, that is, without spiritual benefit or advantage, is guilty of great contempt of God and Jesus Christ, and aggravates his own damnation, as well as he, who, by partaking of the Lord's Supper unworthily, eats and drinks his own judgment. And when the apostle adds, "But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup," it seems clear, by the occasion and circumstances of his discourse, that he does not intend we should examine our state of grace, whether we are true believers or not, and sincerely resolved to continue so, but he speaks of the actual fitness and worthiness of the *Corinthians* at that time, when they came to receive the Lord's Supper. And, therefore, verse 20, he sharply reproves their irreverent and unsuitable carriage at the Lord's table, they coming thereunto disorderly, one before another. It was the custom of *Christians* then to meet at the *feast of charity*, in which they did communicate with great sobriety and temperance; and when that was ended, they celebrated the Lord's Supper. Now, among *the Corinthians* this order was broken; the rich met, and excluded the poor from this common feast; and after an irregular feast, (one after another eating his own supper as he came,) they went to the sacrament *in great* disorder; one was hungry, having eaten nothing at all; others had drank and eat intemperately; and the poor were despised and neglected. This the apostle condemns as a great profanation of that solemn institution, for behaving themselves with as little reverence, as if it were a common supper or feast; and this he calls, "not discerning the Lord's body," making no difference between the sacrament and a common meal, which contemptuous carriage he calls *eating and drinking unworthily*, for which he pronounceth them *guilty of the body and blood of Christ*, by which, he tells them, they did incur the judgment of God, which he calls *eating and drinking their own judgment*, for so the word signifies in the *Greek*, and not eternal condemnation; it is meant of some

temporal judgment and chastisement, in order to the preventing of eternal damnation, which is evident from what follows; "For this cause, many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep." That is, for this irreverence of theirs, God sent among them several diseases, of which many had died. And then he adds, "For if we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged." That is, if we would censure and examine ourselves, so as to be more careful for the future, we should escape the judgment of God in those temporal punishments. "But when we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord, that we should not be condemned of the world." That is, when, by neglecting thus to judge ourselves, we provoke God to judge us, he inflicts these temporal judgments upon us to prevent our eternal damnation.

From the Christian Observer.

THE CHRISTIAN PARADOX.

MANY passages of Scripture, particularly in the Epistles of the New Testament, appear to be primarily, or exclusively, designed for the consolation of the early followers of Jesus Christ. St. Paul, for example, occasionally refers to circumstances peculiar to himself and his immediate associates; and, of course, only applicable indirectly to the situation of their successors in the faith and hope of the Gospel.

In illustration of these obvious remarks, may be selected that portion of the Apostle's address to the Corinthian church, where he describes their instructers, "*as deceivers, and yet true; as unknown, and yet well known; as dying, and behold, we live; as chastened, and not killed; as sorrowful, yet always rejoicing; as poor, yet making many rich; as having nothing, and yet possessing all things.*" I shall offer, consecutively, a few observations on the several members of this sublime paradox; in reference, not merely to the circumstances of the primitive church, but to the actual experience (using that term in its legitimate sense) of all devout persons to the end of time.

1. St. Paul guards the introductory clause, by prefixing the conjunction *as;* thus partially unveiling the obscurity of his declaration, by intimating, that the hostility of the world proceeded on an erroneous assumption. He might have said, "It is true, that we are treated by our enemies as though we designed to impose upon them; and with all our high profession of pure and disinterested motives, were, in reality, conspirators against their happiness, in order to forward some selfish purpose of our own. Such is the sentence pronounced against us, and a similar judgment was passed on him who gave us our divine commission. Yet, whatever be the decision of the world, we are only deceivers in their opinion; since, before the God of truth, we are *yet true;* making no appeal to the world, but for the sake of Jesus Christ; bearing all things, because he bore them first; and maintaining a good conscience, that with simplicity and godly sincerity we have conducted ourselves throughout the whole of our ministry. If we obtain nothing for our labor but reproach and oppression, it is no more than we taught ourselves to look for; for Jesus long since warned us, 'the disciple is not above his Master:' and we may add, 'therefore, the world know-

eth us not, because it knew him not.' "—To apply this to the universal experience of believers—of *their* also being *as deceivers, and yet true*—it is evident, that practical Christians are mistaken by the world at large; generally regarded either as self-deceivers, or deceivers of others; as men of unsound and superficial virtue, who cover bad intentions under religious pretences. Were this actually the case, the world would be justified, not only in suspecting, but in formally condemning and punishing insincerity so radically mischievous; but, if the contrary be the fact, a condemnation more heavy than human blame will assuredly fall upon the accuser. Had we permission to select our degrees of guilt, we might probably make a prudent choice, if we preferred to bear the criminality of the traitor or the adulterer, rather than the guilt of those who falsely accuse, condemn, and injure the servants of God. Neither let any one conceal from his own conscience, his enmity to religion itself, by saying, "I do not hate religious persons, but only such as pretend to be so;" for the question remains, Have you in your possession an infallible criterion of human character? If you have not, it is your interest, at least, to suspend your decision, rather than to incur the consequences of an unrighteous judgment; remembering what Christ said, "Whosoever shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depths of the sea."

2. *As unknown, and yet well known.* The world looked upon them as persons of no consequence. They had none of the world's greatness: this they had utterly rejected; and their whole scheme of doctrine directly tended to make others refuse it also. It was an integral part of their system to expose the shallowness of human pursuits; to discover the poverty of affluence, the meanness of worldly applause, and the certain ruin consequent upon every scheme of life which compelled men to forget eternity. They were unknown, because the whole of their spiritual state was concealed from common observation. None but themselves knew how perpetually they exercised the graces of humility, confidence, and hope. Their sorrow for sin was not proclaimed to the world, but kept secret in their own bosoms. Their gratitude to Christ Jesus; their dependance on the grace of the Holy Ghost; their aspirations after everlasting rest: all these acts of the Divine life were unknown. How justly, then, might St. Paul elsewhere *describe* religion in the soul *to be* a *hidden life:* "Your life is hid with Christ in God!"—Yet with all this obscurity, these same Apostles were well known. They were, for example, well known to all who branded them as deceivers; well known, also, in a nobler sense, to such as had been healed by their instrumentality; to the cripples, whom a word of theirs had caused to walk; to the blind, who, through them, recovered their sight; to the dead, whom they had summoned back from the grave; and oh, how well known to those whom they had converted, and called from the dross and delusions of this world to the hopes and pleasures of the Gospel! Now, were these persons—(I particularly refer to the subjects of their conversion)

—inconsiderable in number? One sermon of St Peter's was the means of saving three thousand souls. And the period is hastening forward when multitudes, beyond computation, shall assemble before the throne, not one individual of which, if saved by the preaching of the Gospel, but shall gratefully own him who showed him the way of salvation.—This second member of the Christian paradox is applicable also to all believers, whose inward life is concealed, while their exterior is known like that of others. It is impossible to select a religious character by the appearance of his person; but, could we inspect his heart, the test would never fail. Inwardly, he is unknown to us; externally, he may be well known; at once, familiar and yet a stranger; we know him, and we know him not. If, indeed, he has been our spiritual benefactor, —not a mere man of religious eloquence, a devotional orator, or a fluent talker about the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven,— in that case, he is far from being strange to us; our spiritual connexion with him becomes personal; we have pleasure in seeing him, and in feeling that our friendship is brightened by the hues of immortality.—Yet, beware! "Let no man glory in man."

3. *As dying, and behold we live.* They were on the confines of death, but still alive; "always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in their mortal flesh. For we which live," says the Apostle, "are always delivered unto death for Jesus' sake. So then death worketh in us!"—Under these affecting circumstances of the infant church, its instructers always regarded themselves as on the verge of their eternal state; within sight of the fire and the sword, of the prison and the cross; death ever in view; a martyr's crown ever suspended over them, but not to be reached, except by a martyr's sacrifice. As though they had addressed themselves to the surrounding world, saying, "Although we continually press the borders of the grave, yet do we live a kind of living death, a dying life; a state between mortality and immortality, between our pilgrimage and our rest. The world, longing for our death, views us as already gone: they are lying in wait for us, and would willingly disengage their consciences from the silent but unwelcome reproof of our daily example. But hitherto not a hair of our heads has perished: though summoned before the tribunals of idolaters, and accused there by our own countrymen, yet are we untouched. Like Shadrach and his brethren, we have, as it were, passed through the fiery furnace, and have no hurt; upon our bodies the fire has had no power; and this, because the God of Shadrach has sent his angel, and delivered his servants that trusted in him. With Daniel, we have been cast to the lions, and no manner of hurt has been found upon us, because we have believed in his God."—Christians of the present day appear to have less concern with this division of the subject than with the preceding. The cruelties of the primitive ages, and the comparatively recent terrors of the Marian persecution, are become matters of ecclesiastical history, and are read of in our domestic circles as annals of times which never will nor can return. "The distance of a calamity from the present

time seems to preclude the mind from contact or sympathy. Events long past are barely known: they are not considered."* It would be foreign to my present purpose to speculate on the restoration of an age of persecution; and I shall pass on to observe, that though a believer in Jesus Christ is no longer summoned to revive in his own person the glowing zeal of Shadrach,

"To weary tortures and rejoice in fire,"

yet a consistent Christian must expect, more or less, to be disturbed by the stifled murmurs of a world which is still *at enmity with God.* So supremely excellent, indeed, is the Gospel, that this very world is unconsciously softened, even in its opposition against religion, by the general diffusion of Christian maxims, and by their partial adoption into the political systems of mankind. Human laws equally protect the infidel and the saint: neither is the unbeliever favoured because of his scepticism, nor the children of God left unprotected on account of their sanctity.—The use we should make of the Apostle's saying, "as dying, and behold we live," is to ask ourselves what would probably be our own degree of constancy should persecution overtake us. One criterion for determining this point may be found by considering what is the actual victory achieved over our sins. In proportion as our vanity, sensual affections, and worldly attachments are martyred, may we aspire to join the noble army led on by Cranmer, Latimer, and Hooper, and such other confessors as have marshalled the way to glory.

4. *As chastened, and not killed.* Their afflictions were numerous and hard to be borne, but they did not despond. They were chastised, but not with unmeet severity. It was the correction of a parent, the faithful wound of a friend. "We are troubled," St. Paul elsewhere declares, "on every side, yet not distressed: we are perplexed, but not in despair; persecuted, but not forsaken; cast down, but not destroyed." There went a blessing with the affliction, a mercy with the chastisement.—It is much the same with believers in every age; and grateful are they for the compassionate severity by which their God and Father would separate their souls from vanity and guilt. Their original nature is ever tempting them to look back to forsaken habits of sin; but something arises to awaken and to fix their attention on the heavenly objects they profess to be seeking. Mercy assumes the more awful appearance of authority, and cries, "Here you have no continuing city: it is only the threshold of eternity, and the Lord is coming as a thief in the night; watch, therefore, lest, coming suddenly, he find you sleeping."

5. *As sorrowful, yet always rejoicing.* When Christians look on the world, there seems to be nothing but a vast aggregate of sin; and the sight of this compels them to mourn. When they direct their eyes upward, there is "joy unspeakable and full of glory." The Apostle did not scruple to say, "If in this life only we have hope in Christ, then we are of all men most miserable;" but he might have added, with triumphant confidence, As in the life to come we have *also* hope in Christ, then are we of all men most happy. Sorrowful all Christians must be while

* Johnson.

contemplating their own inherent and actual guilt, and the spiritual devastations extended throughout the world; but rejoicing while conscious of the dignity conferred on their nature by Christ; rejoicing in their own renovation through his grace and atoning blood, in the offer of universal salvation to their fellow-sinners, in the actual success of his Gospel on earth, and, finally, in the anticipation of a kingdom yet to come, where the Saviour will display his everlasting triumphs. What a contrariety of feelings do these things suppose! On one side, there is unmixed distress; on the other, abounding consolation.

6. *As poor, yet making many rich.* The early disciples of Jesus were required to bid farewell to the wealth of this world. When the lame man looked at St. Peter, supposing he should receive the usual expressions of pity and assistance, the Apostle said, "Silver and gold have I none, but such I have give I thee; in the name of Jesus of Nazareth, rise up and walk." With all their poverty, the Apostles communicated in large abundance the treasures of Heaven.—Few, it is to be feared, among the thousands of our indigent neighbors and dependants, are aware of their ability to make others rich; yet the most abject beggar—abject in regard to external necessities—might be a living sermon to others: his submission and religious cheerfulness might convince every observer that the meek inherit the earth; and that a Lazarus, however oppressed by want, or groaning under disease, displays the only true greatness of mind, and is honored by God as an example, to the noble and the mighty, of the substantial excellence of a Gospel which they have either overlooked or rejected.—Come, ye wise, ye disputers of this world, and study here the triumphs of the cross; enrich yourselves by this beggar's humility, self-crucifixion, and gratitude; bid your philosophy bow before the graces of Christianity, as they diffuse their divine lustre over the immortal part of this poor outcast; approach, and shrink not from the sight of his sordid and wasted person, for it imprisons a soul of equal value with your own, and purchased by the same costly sacrifice; come, and learn, and live forever!

7. *As having nothing, and yet possessing all things:*—nothing which they could call, or were desirous of calling, their own; yet, at the same time, conscious that all things, when God pleased, were placed at their disposal. "All things," said St. Paul to the saints at Corinth, "are yours; whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come,—all are yours." In this seventh clause, or climax, terminating the description of a believer's mysterious state below, may be observed a Christian's independence on this present world. If he have nothing, he wants nothing; but he remembers the immutable, though conditional, promise, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all other things shall be added unto you."

I have somewhere read of a devout woman, who, being in possession of but a single loaf, was overheard saying, *What, all this and heaven too!* Whether the anecdote be correct or otherwise, is of no material consequence. The fact is unquestiona-

ble, that a spirit consistent with such a story exists and thrives in the bosom of every heavenly-minded person. It is also observable, that although this climax seems to be, if I may so term it, the exclusive property of a poor man, yet its meaning is certainly realized in the feelings and practice of the affluent Christian (and persons so designated are, God be thanked, yet to be found within the militant church) whose mind is so detached from his external circumstances, as to produce a spiritual identity between himself and his indigent fellow-christian. There is an abstraction of soul common to both. Further, poverty and riches have, it is true, their respective departments of duty, and their peculiar sources of temptation; yet, I believe, the experience of any individual, who possesses the riches of both worlds, has frequently convinced him that his golden barriers afford no security against the intrusions of sorrow. He, too, has moments of desertion, abandonment, and solitude; and such as would tempt him (were he accessible to the full influence of the temptation) to wish for an exchange of lots with some pauper, who, however hard his fate and labor, had yet a few friends left to sympathize with his difficulties, and to share in his toils. Oh! what are gold and silver in the days of darkness! In that gloomy period, affluence itself *has nothing*. Still, the character I am supposing, will at that very time *possess all things;* having "treasure where neither moth nor rust corrupt, nor thieves break through and steal."

I have called this paper "The Christian Paradox;" a term which, if my memory be correct, is applied by Lord Verulam to the apparent contrarieties which exist in the economy of grace. May it be given unto us to know the mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven! Every subject of that kingdom is a mystery to himself. *As unknown, and yet well known,* must be his motto to the last; a strange confusion of self-knowledge and self-ignorance must perplex his inquiries, and create long fluctuation, of hope and anxiety. His state, if he dared to examine it with the coolness of philosophical investigation, might seem well to awaken and amuse curiosity, and furnish a thousand plausible theories of moral sentiment; but he *finds it* to be a matter of life and death; a question between time and eternity. Intellectual inquiries, as he knows, have their legitimate place in religion; but it is only where they terminate in the conscience. The concerns of our salvation may, and ought to call our discursive powers *into* full exercise; but let that exercise be sanctified,

> —— Philosophy, baptiz'd
> In the pure fountain of eternal love,
> Has eyes indeed; and, viewing all she sees
> As meant to indicate a God to man,
> Gives HIM the praise, and forfeits not her own.
> Such was thy wisdom, Newton, child-like sage!——

It is a painful reflection, that most of the great masters of human learning have been deficient in the only department of knowledge which will be found valuable in the hour of death, and in the day of judgment. They have examined and subdued a thousand difficulties in moral and physical science, have explained the paradoxes of material nature, and many curious phenomena of intellect; but have abandoned the science of the heart——to whom? To the glorious company of the Apostles, to the goodly fellow-

ship of the Prophets, to the noble army of Martyrs; to those who, though they "have the first fruits of the Spirit, do yet groan within themselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of their body." ARATOR.

From the Utica Christian Repository.

THE PILGRIM'S PROGRESS IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.—BY BUNYANUS.

CHAPTER XX.

No-law. Now we are upon the subject of perfection, I should like to hear brother Feel-well's arguments to prove that some Christians attain such perfection in this life, as to live without committing any sin.

Feel-well. I prove it by this, that some are called *perfect* in the scriptures. "Noah was a just man, and perfect in his generations." Job "was perfect and upright." The Psalmist says, "Mark the perfect man, and behold the upright." The apostle says, "We speak wisdom among them that are perfect." And, "let us, therefore, as many as be perfect, be thus minded."

Thoughtful. So also all christians are called *saints*, or sanctified ones, *holy*, *righteous*, and the like; which are as strong terms as *perfect* and *upright*. Doubtless these terms imply, that those who are so called have some right affections, and perform some right actions. They have some conformity to the rule of right. But to infer from this that those right affections continue for whole days and months, and even years, without any intermixture of wrong ones, and especially that these terms are applicable only to a part of the children of God, who have been the subjects of that second experience which you have described, is to take for granted the very thing in dispute, the very thing you ought to prove. On the other hand, it is plain that the scriptures divide mankind into two great classes, to one or the other of which all belong. They call one class sinners, and the other saints; one righteous, and the other wicked; one holy, and the other unholy. But you seem to make three classes, one of sinners, another of saints, or sanctified ones, and another of those who are justified, but not sanctified, and who must therefore be neither saints nor sinners. I still wait for proof.

F. w. We are commanded to be perfect. "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect. Walk before me, and be thou perfect. Thou shalt be perfect with the Lord thy God. Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind." And my author says, "if the love of God fill *all the heart*, there can be no sin there."

Th. I acknowledge that we are commanded to be perfect; and so are all men. But you certainly will not say that no man is ever commanded to do any more than he actually does. This would be to say there is no sin in the world. But if you admit that any are commanded to do more than they actually do, then it still remains to be proved that there are any who actually do all that they are commanded.

F. w. Is it not written, "He that saith I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him?"

Th. Yes. But that declaration cuts off all from being christians who do not keep his commandments; and so excludes your

class of justified ones, who are not yet sanctified. And if it means that none are christians who do not keep his commandments all the time, without any acts of disobedience intervening, it excludes all men whatever, according to your own statements. But if it only means, as I suppose it does, that none are christians who do not perform some acts of holy obedience from day to day, so that they do habitually, though not uninterruptedly, walk in his statutes, then it avails nothing towards a proof that any are so perfect as to live from day to day without committing any sin. There appears no proof of that yet.

F. w. There are many promises to that effect. The Psalmist says, "He shall redeem Israel from *all* his iniquities." By the prophet Ezekiel, it is said, "From *all* your filthiness will I cleanse you, and I will save you from *all* your uncleanness." It was for this purpose that the prince Immanuel laid down his life, "that he might redeem us from *all* iniquity." He "loved the church, and gave himself for it, that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish."

Th. These promises will all be fulfilled in due time. But, in applying them to your purpose, you take several things for granted, which you are bound to prove. You should prove that they have respect to your particular class of sanctified ones, and not equally to all Christians. You should prove that they not only promise a cleansing from past iniquities, but a security against falling into any more; which security you do not believe any to have in this life. And you should prove that they are completely fulfilled in some individuals some time before death, so that they live from day to day without committing any more sin; which is the very thing in dispute.

F. w. There is a declaration to that effect, which is in the present tense. "If we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from *all* sin." It now cleanseth us, and it cleanseth us from *all* sin too." And it is added also, "if we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us *from all* unrighteousness."

Th. I believe too, that "*if* we walk in the light, as he is in the light," *if* we repent of our sins, and turn from them with the whole heart, *if* we confess our sins, and forsake them, we do obtain forgiveness of *all* that are past, through the blood of Christ. But, what then? Where *is the* promise that we shall not fall into new sins, within an hour, or within a less space of time, after our old sins are repented of, and forgiven? Where is the proof that any continue for days and months without committing any new sins? I see none.

Feel-well. It appears from the thanksgiving of Zacharias; "He hath raised up an horn of salvation for us,—that we, being delivered out of the hand of our enemies, might serve him without fear, in holiness and righteousness before him, *all the days of our life.*"

Th. If this proves any thing to your purpose, it proves too much; namely, that those who are once delivered from the bondage of sin and Satan, shall never sin any more, all the days of their

life; which you do not believe, any more than I. They "*might*," indeed, and they *ought* to continue sinless all the days of their life; but they do not. And if this were a promise that they should, it would be as fatal to your scheme as to mine.

F. w. There are, as my author observes, "prayers for entire sanctification which, were there no such thing, would be a mere mockery of God." Our Lord has taught us to pray, "deliver us from evil," which doubtless means *all evil*. He himself prayed for those who had believed on him, and for those who should believe through their word, that they all might be made perfect in one. Paul prayed for the Ephesians, that they might be "filled with all the fulness of God;" and for the Thessalonians, "the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit, and soul, and body, be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ."

Th. If these prayers prove what you quote them for, they prove more, and a great deal more than you believe. They prove that christians are not subjects of *any* evil in this world, natural or moral; that they suffer no pain nor sickness, nor any afflictions of any kind; that they are all perfect, all the time, being sanctified wholly, and preserved blameless in all respects, from the time they become christians, till the coming of their Lord; which you do not believe any more than I. If every thing prayed for had been granted, all men would have been converted long ago.

F. w. But some have experienced a perfect deliverance from all sin. "If we love one another, God dwelleth in us, and his love is perfected in us. Whoso keepeth his word, in him verily is the love of God perfected. Herein is our love made perfect, that we may have boldness in the day of judgment: because as he is, so are we in this world. Every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as he is pure." When the Gentiles were converted, God made no difference between them and the Jews, "purifying their hearts by faith."

Th. All this is nothing to your purpose in the present dispute. It only proves what I believe and contend for, in opposition to both you and your companions. I believe that the moral law is the only standard of perfection, the only rule of right and wrong, and that none are christians but those who have some right affections, some which are conformed to the moral law, and who are, so far as those right affections extend, renewed "after the image of Him that created them;" which is equally denied by you and your fellow travellers. But the question now is, whether any live in the uninterrupted exercise of holy affections, and continue days and months, and even years without committing any sin. How do you prove that?

F. w. I prove it by the testimony of those who are examples of it. A man sustains a good character for veracity. Now, as my author says, "I have abundant reason to believe this person will not lie. He testifies before God, 'I feel no sin, but all love: I pray, rejoice, and give thanks without ceasing: and I have as clear an inward witness that I am fully renewed, as that I am justified. At such a time I felt a change which I am not able to express. And since that time I have not felt pride, or self-will,

or wrath, or unbelief, nor any thing but a fulness of love to God and to all mankind.' Now, if I have nothing to oppose to this plain testimony, I ought in reason to believe it. And I know many of this description."

Th. Your proof, then, is all reduced to the testimony of those whom you admit to be liable to mistake. And I think it would be most rational to conclude they were mistaken in this, and were led to think they lived without sin, from ignorance of the nature of sin and of their own hearts. They first make a standard of perfection different from that which God has made, and then imagine they live up to it. They appear to me to be in that state in which the young ruler was when he said of the commandments, "all these have I kept from my youth up," and in which Paul was, of which he says, "I was alive without the law once." But should the commandment come home to their consciences, in all the spirituality and extent of its precept, they would find sin revived, and would be convinced, as Paul was, that many of those things which they verily thought they ought to do, were entirely wrong, and nothing but transgressions of the law of God.

F. w. I think, with my author, that if such a man is deceived, "it is a harmless mistake, while he feels nothing but love in his heart. It is a mistake which generally argues great grace, a high degree both of holiness and happiness."

Th. I should rather think, that such a mistake is one which does not argue great grace, but great want of it. The Scripture says, "There is a generation that is pure in their own eyes, and yet is not washed from their filthiness." Their being pure in their own eyes, does not argue great grace in these persons. The Pharisee, who thanked God that he was not as other men, was in the same mistake; and it was no proof of great grace in him. Neither do I think such a mistake can be harmless. How shall a man repent of and forsake sins, of which he is not convinced? While he is "alive without the law," and thinks himself perfectly free from sin, he is in the high road to perdition. He cannot be saved, till he shall be convinced of his mistake, be slain by the law, and be so made alive by Christ as to be conformed in heart to the law of God, that law which you set aside, but which the apostle says is not made void by faith but rather established.

F. w. Why should you be opposed to christian perfection? Why will you plead for the continuance of sin as long as you *live*? "Will you plead for Baal?" Let his worshippers plead for him; but, as my author says, "let not the children of God any longer fight against the image of God. Let not the members of Christ say any thing against having the whole mind that was in Christ. What pity that those who desire and design to please him, should have any other design or desire? much more that they should dread, as a fatal delusion, yea, abhor, as an abomination to God, the having this one desire and design, ruling every temper!"

Th. How uncandid and sophistical is all this! Because I do not believe that any do actually live without sin, you represent me as unwilling that they should, and as pleading for liberty to continue in sin. On the contrary, you *know* that I contend for a higher stand-

ard of perfection than you do, and insist that it is the duty of all men to be conformed to it, without interruption, and that they have no excuse, and deserve eternal damnation for every deficiency. And yet, you represent me as being opposed to perfect obedience! Is this honest? And besides, this representation can be retorted upon you, if any are so disposed. You do not believe the doctrine of the certain perseverance of every real saint in holy obedience to eternal life. And are you, therefore, unwilling to have the saints persevere? Are you opposed to their continuance in holy obedience unto the end? You believe and endeavor to prove, that some real saints do fall away and perish. Do you, therefore, plead in favor of falling away unto perdition? Do you "plead for Baal" in this?

F. w. What arguments have you against the doctrine of christian perfection?

Th. That christians do not, in this life, attain such perfection as to live without committing any sin, but that the best of men do commit some sins from day to day, I think is evident from very express declarations of scripture. This is one; "There is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good, and sinneth not."

F. w. On this text, one of my favorite authors, (and a learned Doctor too,) observes, that Solomon meant that "there were none but that sinned against the Adamic law; or, he meant those *involuntary* transgressions, which under the ceremonial law, required an atonement."

Th. What if they do *sin* against the Adamic law? So I suppose. That is the same as the moral law, and is the only standard of right and wrong. In saying this, you give up the point in dispute, and admit that they do *sin*, which is what I was attempting to prove, in opposition to your doctrine of perfection. I do not believe there is any such thing as an *involuntary* transgression; but if there is, it must be a *sin;* for it is written, "sin is the transgression of the law." And you concede that these involuntary transgressions, or *mistakes*, as you have sometimes called them, "were it not for the blood of atonement, would expose to eternal damnation." But it is absurd to suppose that any thing which is not *sin* needs the atoning blood, or that man can be exposed to eternal damnation for that which is not *sin*. Your very attempt to avoid the force of the declaration, discovers its strength, and the weakness of your cause. It is true, that "there is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good, and sinneth not." And therefore it is not true, as you affirm, that your class of sanctified ones "are now in such a sense perfect as not to commit sin, and to be freed from evil desires and evil tempers, having their minds *at all times* even and calm, and their souls *continually* streaming up to God, in holy joy, prayer, and praise." To the same effect is what Solomon, says, in his prayer at the dedication of the temple, "*there is no man that sinneth not.*"

F. w. The aforementioned Doctor informs us, that this means, "There are none but are liable to sin."

Th. Indeed! How does he know that is the meaning? That is not what it says. It says, "There is no man that *sinneth* not." And because you choose to contradict it, and say, there *is* many a man that sinneth not, you will have it mean something dif-

ferent from what it says. Is this a fair specimen of your regard for the authority of Scripture? Doubtless, then, you will with equal ease and boldness avoid or contradict every other similar declaration. And when the scripture asks, "who can say, I have made my heart clean, I am pure from my sin?" You will answer, many can say it with truth. And when it declares, "if we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us, you will answer, "No, we do not deceive ourselves; and if we do, "it is a mistake which generally argues great grace," and proves that the truth is in us in a high degree. And when it says, "in many things we offend all," you will reply, No, we do not all offend, for there are many who do not commit any sin. But, what do you say of the apostle's declaration to the Galatians, "The flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other: so that ye cannot do the things that ye would?"

F. w. The same learned Doctor informs us that it is applicable only to those that are fallen, and not to real christians.

Th. Had Paul fallen from grace, then, when he describes his own experience, in the 7th chapter to the Romans? He says, "For that which I do, I allow not: for what I would, that do I not; but what I hate that do I. If then I do that which I would not, I consent unto the law that it is good. Now then it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. For I know that in me, (that is in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing: For to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not. For the good that I would I do not: but the evil which I would not that I do. Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. I find then a law, that, when I would do good, evil is present with me. For I delight in the law of God after the inward man. But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members. O wretched man that I am! Who shall deliver me from the body of this death? I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then, with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin." Is this the experience of Paul as fallen from grace?

F. w. No; it was his experience before he was converted. At that time, he could say with truth, "I am carnal, sold under sin;" for he was so. But he could not say this after he became a christian, for, in the same epistle he tells us, "to be carnally minded is death." But he did not fall away. He says, "I have fought a good fight: I have kept the faith."

Th. I see no reason why you should make such a difference between this passage and that to the Galatians. They both appear to me to speak the same language, and describe the same thing. But, because in this place Paul speaks of himself, and you cannot believe he fell from grace, and are not willing to admit he was describing a christian experience, you groundlessly assert that it was his experience before he became a christian. It was indeed true of him before he became a christian, that he was "carnal, sold under sin;" and it was true of him all the time. It

is also true that, "to be carnally minded is death," and that, "the carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." And therefore, he could not then say of himself, as he does in this passage, "I consent unto the law that it is good.—I delight in the law of God after the inward man.—With the mind I myself serve the law of God." These are christian exercises, and not those of an impenitent sinner. These could only be true of him after he became a christian. But it was also true of him, after he became a christian, that he often failed of doing the good which he purposed, and often had occasion to say, "what I hate that do I." He had holy affections and unholy ones interchangeably, in such rapid succession, that he often had occasion to say, "to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not." In this passage, as well as in that to the Galatians, he deseribes the experience of every real christian.

Love-self. But this passage seems to me to contradict your scheme, as well as brother Feelwell's. It seems to teach that holy and unholy affections coexist, at the same instant, in the heart of the christian. And, indeed, unless this is the case, there can be no warfare.

Th. The christian warfare consists in resisting the assaults of temptation. It is quite possible to do that with the whole heart, as the example of the Lord Jesus clearly shows. It is through the animal appetites that temptations are commonly presented. When they are excited, a motive is presented to the mind to choose something wrong, in order to gratify them. When they are strongly excited the temptation is violent, and requires great resistance. Then there is a strong contention. When the mind yields, and consents to that which is wrong, the battle is over, and the man is a captive to his lust. When he continues to resist till the excitement of the appetites ceases; the battle ceases, and the man is a conqueror. Thus it is that the law in the members wars against the law of the mind.

Love. s. But the apostle says, "when I would do good, evil is present with me." What can this mean, if holy and unholy affections do not co-exist, at the same instant?

Th. At the same instant that the holy affection is in full strength, the evil of temptation may exist, and be presenting its powerful solicitations, through the violent excitement of the animal appetites. But I suppose the true way of removing the difficulty which you suggest, is by appealing to the original, where it vanishes. Learned men of your side of the question have been obliged to admit that the most literal translation of the passage, is, "*to me willing to do good evil lies near.*" The evil of temptation, as I said, may exist at the same instant, and the evil of complying with the temptation may be so near as to follow the act of resistance at the next instant. This apparent (but not real) difficulty being removed, the rest of the language appears to me well adapted to describe the experience of all real christians, who are conscious of loving and hating the same things alternately, in very rapid succession; but are not conscious of loving and hating the same thing at the same instant.

Love-s. I do not yet see how

that can be. He speaks of *sin dwelling in him*, saying, "it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me."

Th. Sin is not a *person*, that does any thing. This must be a personification; and I think is equivalent to his declaration, that, with the flesh he served the law of sin. He sometimes indulged carnal affections, in which he served the law of sin, or was brought into captivity to the law of sin which was in his members. But that my meaning may appear more fully, I will paraphrase the whole passage as follows:

For that which I do, at one time, I allow not, at another: for what I would, at one time, that do I not, at another; but what I hate, at one time, that do I, at another. If then I do, at one time, that which, at another, I would not, I consent unto the law that it is good. Now then it is no more I, in the exercise of grace, that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me, that is, but I in the exercise of sinful affections, into which I am often falling. For I know that in me, (that is in my flesh,) in me when in the exercise of sin, dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me, at one time; but how to perform that which is good I find not, on account of the rapid change in my affections. For the good that I would, that I purpose at one time, I do not accomplish: but the evil which I would not, which I purpose not to do, that I do. Now if I, at one time, do that which at another I would not, or purposed not to do, it is no more I in the exercise of grace that do it, but I in the exercise of sin. I find then a law, an established course of events, that to me willing to do good evil lies near. For I delight in the law of God after the inward man. But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me oftentimes into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members. O wretched man that I am, to have such sore conflicts with temptation and to be so frequently falling into sin! Who shall deliver me from this body of death, from these temptations and backslidings? I thank God that there is a way of deliverance through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then this is my experience, that with the mind, with the new heart, by the exercise of grace, I myself serve the law of God, but with the flesh, in the exercise of the carnal mind, I often serve the law of sin.

For the Christian Magazine.

EXPOSITION OF MATT. XXII. 41—45.

"While the Pharisees were gathered together, Jesus asked them, saying, What think ye of Christ? whose son is he? They say unto him, The son of David. He saith unto them, How then doth David in spirit call him Lord, saying, The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool? If David then call him Lord, how is he his son?" Matt. xxii. 41—45.

OUR blessed Lord, on this memorable occasion, manifested striking evidence of his consummate wisdom. While seriously contemplating his peculiar method of teaching religion as exhibited in the present instance, we are led, instinctively, to exclaim, He was truly a Divine Teacher; for surely, "never man spake like this man." He, evidently, knew what was in man; and he always, most skilfully, adapted his instructions to the capacities and circumstances of those, who listened to his heavenly voice. He

knew, very well, that the Jews were, at that time, anxiously expecting the promised Messiah; and he also knew, that their opinion respecting the dignity of his person, and the nature of his kingdom, was exceedingly erroneous. It was, therefore, his benevolent intention, on the present occasion, to correct this opinion, to elevate their grovelling views from earthly to heavenly things, and thus to enable them, gradually, to form more just and adequate conceptions of the personal dignity of the Messiah, and the spiritual nature of his kingdom.

Accordingly, he introduced his conversation with the Parisees, by asking the preliminary question, "What think ye of Christ?" or the promised Messiah, "Whose son is he?" This question they could easily answer; for they, doubtless, had read in their Scriptures, "Behold, the days come, saith Jehovah, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and he shall execute judgment and justice in the earth." Jer. xxiii. 5. "Jehovah hath sworn in truth unto David. He will not turn from it, of the fruit of thy body will I set upon thy throne." Ps. cxxxii. 11. From these and other similar passages of Scripture, they naturally concluded, that the Messiah would be a lineal descendant of the patriarch David; and accordingly, they answered the question proposed, with readiness, by say that he was "the son of David."

Having thus prepared the way, our Lord proceeds to ask, "How then doth David in spirit, (i. e. by divine inspiration,) call him Lord, saying, (Ps. cx.) The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool." If David then call him Lord, how is he his son? This question, it seems, perplexed and entirely put to silence those learned and self-conceited interpreters of the sacred oracles, (the Jewish Scribes) for "no man was able to answer him a word." How the same person could possess such different attributes, or sustain such different characters, as to be justly styled, according to their own Scriptures, both David's son and David's Lord, seemed to them utterly incomprehensible; and their silence proves that the question appeared to them unanswerable.

The genuine doctrine of the Scriptures, respecting the Messiah, our Lord Jesus Christ, seems to furnish the only rational and satisfactory solution of the difficulty in question.

According to the predictions of the Prophets, and the history of the Evangelists, our Lord Jesus Christ was actually born at Bethlehem, the city of David, of a virgin who was lineally descended from that ancient patriarch; and hence, according to the usual manner of speaking amongst the Jews, he was properly called the son of David. Now it is manifest, that he was the son of Mary, and consequently, the lineal descendant, or son of David, only in respect to his humanity. But, if he were merely a man, as the Jews, "judging after the flesh," generally supposed, and as many, professing to be christians, at the present day assert; how could he, with any propriety, be also called *David's Lord?* since he was born more than a thousand years after the death of his royal progenitor. This is the very difficulty which silenced the Pharisees, and which, one would suppose, would put to silence the confident assertions of those, who

deny the proper divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ. Such persons, I think, ought seriously to consider the words, which our Lord addressed to the ancient Jews, "Ye neither know me, nor whence I am. If ye had known me, ye should have known my Father also." Paul also says, "No man can call Jesus Lord, except by the Holy Spirit."

But, having already shown why Jesus was called David's son, it now remains to show, why he is also called David's *Lord*. All our information on this subject, must be derived from the Scriptures, for "they are they which testify of Jesus Christ." The concurrent testimony of the Old and New Testaments, respecting this point, will afford the candid and humble inquirer, ample satisfaction.

Isaiah, who is justly styled the evangelical Prophet, says, "A virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel, (i. e. *God with us.*") And again; "Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be on his shoulder, and his name shall be called, *the mighty God*, the *everlasting Father*, the Prince of peace." Jeremiah, also, speaking of the same glorious person, says, "His name shall be called Jehovah our righteousness."

Agreeably to these predictions, and, indeed, to the whole spirit of prophecy, which is testimony concerning Jesus, the Evangelist John, declares in his Gospel, that the "Word, which was in the beginning with God, and which was God, was made flesh," or became man, "and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory." And in his epistle, he asserts, that "Jesus Christ is the true God and eternal life." The Apostle Paul, also, declares plainly that God was manifest in the flesh; the great God, even our Saviour Jesus Christ; who, indeed, according to the flesh, or in respect to his humanity, was descended from Jewish ancesters; but who, nevertheless, is God over all, blessed forever, for in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily."

From these express declarations of Scripture, and numerous others of a similar import, and also from the fact, that *Divine attributes*, *works*, and *worship*, are ascribed to our Lord Jesus Christ, we conclude that he is really God as well as man. In his adorable person, are united and concentrated, every human and every divine perfection, so as to attract our warmest love, and command our highest veneration.

In respect to the humanity, which, in his infinite mercy, he condescended to assume, for the gracious purpose of *manifesting* himself propitiously to his rebellious creatures, and accomplishing the glorious work of their redemption, reconciliation, and salvation, he was called the son of Mary, or the son of David. But in respect to his essential divinity, he was not the son of either, but God himself, manifest in the flesh; even the *mighty God;* the everlasting Father; the King of kings, and Lord of lords; the blessed and only Potentate; and, of course, not only David's Lord, but he is to be acknowledged and adored, by all creatures, as the supreme Lord of heaven and earth; God over *all*, and blessed forever. T.

The seeds of repentance are sown in youth by pleasure, but the harvest is reaped in age by pain.

For the Christian Magazine.

CHARITY TO THE SICK.

I OPEN my Bible and I read thus: "Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father, is this, To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction," &c. James, i. 27.

To this I give my cordial approbation, because it is *practical* and *useful*. But I ask myself, will this religion prepare me for a heaven of holiness? It is replied, yes; for "pure religion," if any thing, will prepare for heaven.

I next look around among my neighbors, and imagine that I see much of this religion in individuals who give no other evidence of piety. This puts me upon a further inquiry, whether the above passage of Scripture does not recognize a principle of heart which is little regarded, and without which the external duty becomes void of moral excellence. On examination I have come to this conclusion: that all true religion must involve a *principle of holy benevolence;* and that external duties are only natural expressions of this benevolence.

The Scriptures teach us that man will be judged by his *works;* manifestly because works are generally expressive of the state of the *heart*. Still, nothing is more obvious then that the duty of visiting the fatherless and widows in their affliction, may be performed from other motives than those of benevolence. And, that other motives do, too often, actuate those who visit the afflicted, will be evident by considering a few things which I shall now mention.

I go to the sick bed of the widow's child; and find it surrounded by a circle of friends and neighbors, all apparently sympathizing with the afflicted widow. Every one is solicitous to inquire after the welfare of the child, and to bear a part of the burden of the mother. This all looks *kind*. But my observation extends a little further. I am determined not to be cheated with all this excess of kindness which throngs the room of the sick; I will try its value.—Well then, all *needed help*, all *true kindness*, on such occasions, is above *gold*. Yes, I *know* it takes off a burden which loads a sorrowing heart. It deserves gratitude.—Still there are circumstances in common cases which defeat the kindness of the kind. First, injury is often done to the sick by a throng of *talkers*, and forward *advisers*. I will not attempt to show how much evil may be done by advising against the physician. Secondly, an injury is often done to the poor widow, by an unusual increase of her family of *boarders*. Especially is this noticeable during the time in which the sick child requires *watchers*. These kind friends cannot watch a night without multiplying their meals from three a day to four or five. And surely they imagine, to refresh with a little tea or spirit, on such an occasion, is justifiable. —And suppose the sickness is protracted to a great length of time, what will the poor widow find her bill of expenses to be? Her grocery bill will probably surprise her more than that of the physician. She will be astonished to find what quantities of tea, coffee, sugar, flour, spirit, &c. have been consumed in a few weeks. In addition to this, her kind nurse thinks that her wages must be increased in proportion to the sick state of the child.—Now my observation has led me to query whether all this is the true religion of the Scriptures above quoted. And I have

to the conclusion that true religion would *correct* most of the evils which I have noticed. First, true benevolence is not vainly *curious;* and will not suffer me to visit the sick unless I can do *them* a favor. Secondly, benevolence is generous, noble, and self-denying. It will not allow me to unload the table of the poor widow; rather it will move me to *carry with me* all the articles of food which my health may demand in watching a night with the sick. For watching a night, I would not be rewarded with a cup of tea, or a repast of cakes and other nice food. No, benevolence will not make it necessary for the widow to keep one person cooking day after day for *watchers* and kind *visitors.* Instead of *increasing* the expenses of the widow, benevolence will contrive some way to pay the doctor's bill; that while her heart is borne down with the sickness or death of a child, the bill of her expenses in sickness may not aggravate her sorrow. —Surely, I see a principle in the heart of a *religious* man that will move him to visit the sick in the manner last brought to view. Yes, this were religion "pure and undefiled." MEDICUS.

EVILS in the journey of life, are like the hills which alarm travellers upon their road; they both appear great at a distance, but when we approach them we find that they are far less insurmountable than we had conceived.

RELIGIOUS SECTS.

THE following abstract appears in a work (said to be compiled from official documents) which has been recently published in France, on the subject of the religious persuasions of the population of Europe.

	ENGLAND AND WALES.
6,000,000	Church of England,
6,000,000	Dissenters.
	SCOTLAND.
1,500,000	Presbyterians,
50,000	Other Sects.
	IRELAND.
500,000	Church of England,
5,800,000	Catholics,
500,000	Presbyterians,
300,000	Methodists.
	SPAIN.
11,660,000	Catholics.
	PORTUGAL.
3,173,300	Catholics.
	AUSTRIA.
14,000,000	Catholics,
2,000,000	Protestants.
	HUNGARY.
4,200,000	Catholics, [therans, &
3,646,000	Greeks, Calvinists, Lu
	GERMANIC CONFEDERATION.
6,700,000	Catholics,
6,750,000	Protestants.
	LOWER COUNTRIES.
3,500,000	Catholics,
1,500,000	Protestants.
	PRUSSIA.
6,000,000	Lutherans,
4,500,000	Catholics,
1,000,000	Calvinists, &c.
	SWITZERLAND.
1,167,000	Calvinists,
580,000	Catholics.
	SWEDEN AND NORWAY.
3,550,000	Lutherans.
	DENMARK.
1,700,000	Lutherans.
	ITALY.
20,210,000	Catholics.
	FRANCE.
30,855,428	Catholics,
659,000	Calvinists,
280,000	Lutherans,
51,000	Jews.
	RUSSIA IN EUROPE.
39,000,000	Greeks not Catholics,
8,000,000	Catholics,
2,500,000	Protestants,
1,804,000	Mahometans.
	TURKEY IN EUROPE.
7,500,000	Mahometans,
2,500,000	Christians.

THE HEART OPPOSED TO TRUTH.

"THE repugnance of the human mind, in its unenlightened state

to the peculiarities of the Christian doctrines, is such, that we have little hope of its yielding to the voice of the charmer, charm he never so wisely. Till it is touched and humbled by grace, we are apprehensive that it will retain its aversion, and not suffer itself to be cheated into an approbation of the gospel by any artifice of words. Exhibit evangelical religion in what color you will, the worldly minded and the careless will shrink from the obtrusion of unwelcome ideas. Cowper has become, in spite of his religion, a popular poet, but his success has not been such as to make religion popular; nor have the gigantic genius and fame of Milton shielded from the ridicule and contempt of his admirers, that system of religion which he beheld with awful adoration."

Robert Hall.

Review.

For the Christian Magazine.

A Discourse delivered in Hollis Street Church, Boston, September 2, 1827: occasioned by the death of Horace Holley, LL. D. late President of Transylvania University. By John Pierpont, Minister of Hollis Street Church. pp. 31. Boston, 1827.

We have perused the Sermon of the Rev. Mr. Pierpont, on the death of Dr. Holley, with care and with considerable interest; and improve this opportunity to make such remarks upon it as have been suggested to our minds.

The Sermon commences with a biographical sketch of the life of President Holley. This is executed in an accurate, concise, and masterly manner. The various incidents which distinguished his life, such as his course through college, his commencing and relinquishing the study of the law, his pursuing the study of divinity under the direction of President Dwight, his ordination in and dismission from a church at Greenfield, his subsequent installation in Boston, his acceptance of the Presidency of Transylvania University, the reasons of his leaving that situation, his disappointments, and his death; are all related with the justness of a well informed writer. The account of his dying bed is poetical, and in some degree eloquent. In an after part of the discourse, it is stated that "the accomplishment by which Holley was especially distinguished, and in respect to which he stood unquestionably the first, in any profession, in the present age and in our own country, was extemporaneous, popular eloquence." With this statement we most cordially agree; for we have ourselves witnessed his unrivalled talents, in displaying to the admiration of an enraptured multitude this noblest of nature's gifts. His words themselves, despoiled of the dignity, grace, and energy of utterance, contained nothing of charm. If read in the cold columns of print, they would seem little else than mere colloquial conversation, or commonplace discussion, and would not impress a stranger as containing anything remarkable for vivacity, or power, or elegance. But as the

"flowed like honey from his marble lips," they were irresistible. The high and the low, the rich and the poor, the learned and the ignorant, the friend and the enemy, were carried away by an impulse which nothing could withstand. Would that this unrivalled eloquence had been exerted in a better cause, than in inculcating and disseminating those principles which few can admire and extol, and which none but his most enthusiastic friends and admirers can regard as sacred or scriptural. As a lawyer, to bear down the strength and influence of his opponents; as a member of our national legislature, to give, by his ascendant might, stability and force to all measures to promote his country's best interests; as a foreign minister, to wade through the embarrassments and difficulty and turmoil and bustle of public business, instilling into every royal court of Europe one common feeling of respect for this nation—in either of these stations, the talents of Holley must have shone most conspicuously. But as a teacher of the holy and simple religion of Jesus, his feelings, his temperament, his ambition, entirely disqualified him. As a meek and humble follower of the 'Lamb of God,' he never was a 'burning' nor a 'shining light.' And yet, says the author of the Sermon, "while he stood in this place, in the office of an *expositor* of the Christian doctrine, and a preacher of righteousness, he laid his opinions and the grounds of them before his people, freely and boldly." It is true, he did lay his opinions and the grounds of them before his people, 'freely' and 'boldly;' but we are firmly persuaded that no sincere, serious man, whether Trinitarian or Unitarian, can indulge, for a moment, in such extravagant eulogy, as to give to Dr. Holley the character "of a fair *expositor* of the Christian doctrine." If Dr. Holley *exposed* the doctrines of the Bible, he exhibited them with "the foreign aid of ornament," not in their native, proper garb. He robed them in vestments which they had never before been accustomed to wear, which indeed dazzled the eye, and bewildered the mind, but were calculated to recommend the peculiar tenets of the preacher, rather than "the simplicity that is in Christ."

The character of the Sermon before us, is of a singular, and of rather an extraordinary nature. We might have expected, on an occasion like this, that the writer would dwell more fully upon the virtues of the deceased; that he would enlarge upon his personal piety, upon the good he has done to the community, and if his example was worthy of imitation, that he would enforce upon his hearers the practice of these same virtues. We might have expected that the writer would dilate upon the uncertainty of life, upon the joys of immortality, upon the mercies of God, and upon the terrors of his wrath, and exhort his hearers to prepare for judgment. For such topics, we have looked in vain from the beginning of the Sermon to the end, and from the end back again to the beginning. The writer of the discourse before us dwells with animation and force upon the 'promptness and power' which were displayed in the intellect of Holley; upon the dignity and grace of his delivery; upon the overwhelming effects of his eloquence, as exhibited more particularly in his Election Sermon, in "the outright applause, which,

then, for the first and last time in New England, broke out in the house of God, and echoed from its walls;" upon the variety of his attainments, and the versatility of his powers; but more particularly upon his being created a "model of manly beauty and strength." Such were the topics selected to eulogise, in a funeral sermon, delivered on the Lord's day, and in God's house. We are aware that the writer had a difficult and an intricate task to perform, and we are not amazed that he should have felt himself under some considerable embarrassment. Still we think it would have been rather more creditable to the writer; and more gratifying to the friends of Dr. Holley, had the sermon been entirely dispensed with, or else treated in a different manner. As a literary production, (we speak of the manner in which it is executed,) this discourse will be entitled to a first rank. As an oration, it is commendable; as a eulogy, except in some instances of extravagance, it is faithful as far as it goes; nay, as almost any thing but a Sermon, it has some degree of merit; but, as a Sermon, we are under the necessity, in giving our candid opinion, to say, that it deserves not the name.

In vain have we looked, at the close of the discourse, to seek for an application of the sudden death of Dr. Holley to the situation and feelings of those who were present. In vain have we endeavored to obtain so much as one sentence of religious instruction, from a discourse delivered by one who professes to be a teacher of the religion of Jesus, on the occasion of the sudden death of a brother clergyman. A thronged assemblage was gathered in that house. What a glorious opportunity to awaken the sleepy conscience, to warm the cold heart, and to arouse the careless religionist, by earnestly inculcating the solemn truths of the Gospel, by placing before them views of eternity, and by demonstrating to them, and making them *feel* and *realize* that they are not exempted from death. But tell us—ye philosophical, speculating religionists, tell us—What reprobate sinner left that house with his conscience lacerated and torn by conflicting doubts! What obstinate infidel retired with his eye fixed to the ground in solemn thoughtfulness! What skeptic, with a gloom of restless and half formed convictions settled on his brow! What hardy ruffian hurried home to his chamber and threw himself in an agony of horror by his bedside! What shaking Felix trembled as his doom was told him in accents of thunder from the pulpit! What penitent and self-convicted sinner wended his way homeward in silent yet joyful sorrow! What heavenly-minded christian sought his closet, his eye lighted with ecstacy at the near and to him delightful view of death just laid before him! Ah!—what a tremendous responsibility has the minister of the Gospel resting upon him!

In the Sermon before us there is in many places a fine display of language, which, united with the accuracy with which the biography of Dr. Holley is given, and the absence of many subjects which ought always to be treated of in a funeral sermon, and the presence of others which in our opinion ought never to be treated of, give to the Sermon altogether a character which deserves no higher praise than that of being, not 'sublimely great,' but—'*gantly little.*'

Upon the religious character of President Holley we will not now dwell. Suffice it to say, that we believe with the writer of the Sermon, that it is principally and emphatically as an *intellectual* man "that the friends of Mr. Holley would choose to remember him, and that he would choose to be remembered by them."

Religious Intelligence.

Eighteenth Annual Meeting of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions.

THE American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions convened in New York on Wednesday, Oct. 10, in the Session Room of the Pearl-street Church. The following statement of proceedings is copied from the New York Observer.

Public Meetings.

On Wednesday evening, the time appointed for the Annual Sermon, Rev. Dr. Beecher not having arrived in the city, a Dis. ourse was preached to the immense congregation assembled, by the Rev. President Bates, of Middlebury College, from Eph. i. 3, "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ." The introductory services were performed by the Rev. Dr. Miller, of Princeton Theological Seminary.

On Thursday evening a meeting was held at the Brick Church, which like the other, was crowded to overflowing. After Prayer by the Rev. Dr. Ludlow, of Albany, several extracts from the Report were read by the Corresponding Secretary. The Rev. Jonas King, late Missionary to Palestine, then rose and recounted the merciful dealings of Providence towards him during his long absence from his native country, and related many incidents illustrating the efficacy of Gospel truth upon the minds of degenerate Christians, (so called,) and even of Mahomedans. His address was listened to with intense interest, as was also that of the gentleman who followed him, William Maxwell, Esq. Editor of the Journal of Commerce. Seizing upon the incidents which had just been related in the Report concerning Asaad Shidiack, he presented him ("a single captive") to the imagination of his audience, till every one felt how great was the work which the Divine Spirit could perform through the instrumentality of his Missionaries, and then passed on to topics of a more general nature. The audience, on retiring, left behind them, as a token of the gratification they had felt, the handsome sum of $421,50.

Dr. Beecher having reached the city on Thursday morning, he was requested by the Board to deliver a Sermon pursuant to his appointment, which he accordingly did, on Friday evening, in the Reformed Dutch Church in Market-st. Collection, $165 33.

On Monday afternoon, at 4 o'clock, by appointment of the Board, the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was celebrated by its members, in company with several hundred friends of Missions, in the Murray-st. Church. The services were performed by the Rev. Dr. McAuley, Rev. Dr. Proudfit, Rev. Dr. Beecher, and Rev. Mr. Snodgrass. Collection $200. It was made a standing rule of the Board, that hereafter this ordinance shall be administered at every annual meeting of its members.

State of the Funds.

It appeared from the Report of the Treasurer, as examined and declared correct by the Auditor, that the receipts during the year ending August 31st, for general purposes, amounted to $88,341 89. For fund to support Corresponding Secretary, $3,741 94. Do. for support of Treasurer, $234 70. Do. for Mission College in Ceylon, $62. Grand total, $92,380 53.—To the Permanent Fund, amounting to $37,524 87, no addition has been made the past year. The Fund for Corresponding Secretary now amounts to $19,514 54. That for Treasurer to $1,702 50. The total expenditures of the year have amounted to $104,430 30. Showing an excess of expenditures above the receipts for general purposes, of $16,088 41: from which, deducting $575 31, the balance in the Treasury Sept. 1, 1826, there remains an actual deficit of $15,513 10. This, at first glance, might appear discouraging: but if the receipts of the past be compared with those of the previous year, there will be found a clear *gain* of $25,902 55: or if only the receipts for general purposes are considered, a clear gain of $26,725 64.

Outrage at the Sandwich Islands.

The Board resolved unanimously, that they feel with deep sensibility and regret the reported outrages and misconduct of Lieut. Percival, of the U. S. Navy, towards the Missionaries of the Board at the Island of Oahu and the interesting natives of that Isl-

and, and that they fully approve of the representation which has been made on that painful subject to the Secretary of the Navy.

Auxiliary Societies.

The better to promote a spirit of missions in the community, it was declared to be the duty of the members of the Board to attend the anniversaries of its Auxiliaries, whenever required by the Prudential Committee, as a Deputation from that Body.

Mission to Africa.

A Committee on the subject, reported that it was the duty of the Board, as the almoners of the public charity, to take immediate and decisive measures for the establishment of a Mission on some part of the Continent of Africa. This report was adopted: and the Prudential Committee were enjoined forthwith to institute such means as they might deem sufficient, for carrying this object into effect.

Means of extending the operations of the Board.

It was apparent to all who attended the deliberations of the Board, that its members had come together with a spirit of Christian enterprize which was new even to themselves. When the subject was brought forward of sending a Mission to Africa, the feeling of approbation was universal. A discussion ensued, which brought into view, not only the wants of that injured country, but of the whole heathen world. All seemed convinced that the time was come for new and extraordinary efforts A thoughtless multitude may call it weakness, and perhaps fanaticism: but those who have felt the bitterness of sin, and the joys of salvation by a Redeemer, will know how to appreciate their motives, when we say that the moral wretchedness of so many millions of their fellow men, was not contemplated without emotions too big for utterance. But they felt that the work was too great for man, and that they needed wisdom from above. Saturday evening was set apart for the special purpose of supplicating the guidance and blessing of Him who gave it as his last command, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature." On assembling at the beginning of another week, it was found that no loss of interest had been experienced by the intervention of the Sabbath. Appeals were made which will not be forgotten, when the lips that uttered them shall be silent in death. At length it was resolved, that in view of the great success which has attended the means employed for the propagation of the Gospel among the heathen, and of the indications of Divine Providence favorable to a more extended and universal application of these means, and in view of the growing conviction respecting the obligations of Christians to cause the Gospel to be preached throughout the world, that special appeals for liberal contributions to this object should be made to those who possess wealth, or who by the prosperity of their business are enabled to do much in its behalf: That the existing operations, engagements and prospects of the Board, give occasion for a loud and urgent call upon its patrons and friends for more enlarged liberality than at any former period; and that it is exceedingly desirable, that so large an amount of funds should be obtained as shall not only justify a great extension of its operations, but give a new impulse to the public mind, increase the faith and hopes of the Church, and essentially promote the progress of the cause: That as pressing applications have been received by the Prudential Committee from benevolent individuals, both before and during the present session, proposing a plan for the great increase of the resources of the Board, such a voluntary consecration of property to aid in sending the Gospel to the heathen, will be thankfully acknowledged and warmly approved; and that such representations be made by the Prudential Committee and other members of the Board to the Christian public, and especially to the more wealthy and prosperous of its patrons, as shall bring the claims of a perishing world before them.

Officers for the Ensuing Year.

The following officers were chosen for the ensuing year: Hon. John Cotton Smith, *President;* Gen. Stephen Van Rensselaer, *Vice President;* Rev. Dr. Woods, Hon. William Reed, Jeremiah Evarts, Esq. Hon. Samuel Hubbard and Rev. Warren Fay, *Prudential Committee;* Rev. Dr. Chapin, *Recording Secretary;* Jeremiah Evarts, Esq. *Corresponding Secretary;* Henry Hill, Esq. *Treasurer;* Rev. Rufus Anderson, *Assistant Secretary.*

The next annual meeting is to be held in Philadelphia on the 1st Wednesday of Oct. 1828. Rev. Dr. Rice of Virginia is appointed to preach the Sermon, and Rev. Dr. Alexander, of Princeton Theological Seminary, his second.

The Session was closed with prayer by Rev. Dr. Spring at a late hour on Monday evening.

INTERESTING MEETING.

One of the most interesting meetings which we ever attended, (says the editor of the New-York Observer,) was held in the Pearl-street Session Room on Monday evening, October 15. The number of gentlemen present was not large, but they came with an earnest desire to do what they could for sending a knowledge of salvation to the millions of the Pagan world. Zechariah Lewis, Esq. having been called to the chair, and Eleazer Lord, Esq. appointed Secretary, the divine blessing was invoked by the Rev. President Bates, and the object of the meeting stated by the Rev. Dr. Mc Auley.

Mr. Evarts, Corresponding Secretary of the A. B. C. F. M. was then requested to give a statement of the operations of the Board, and of the calls and opportunities for extending them. More missionaries, he said, were urgently needed at Bombay, in Ceylon, at the Mediterranean stations, at the Sandwich Islands, and among the Indians on our

own borders. He also thought it exceedingly important that new missions should be established without delay, in Western Africa, on the Northwest Coast of the United States, and in several other places which he named. In addition to this, missionaries might be employed to the greatest advantage, in visiting distant countries for the purpose of obtaining information relative to the moral condition of the people, distributing Bibles, &c. &c.

The Rev. Jonas King, late Missionary to Palestine, alluded to conversations which he had often held with Mr. Fisk, whose feet he trusted now stand within the gates of the New-Jerusalem, concerning the wants of the countries in and about the Mediterranean. Availing himself of the suggestions of this departed brother, confirmed by his own observation, he then mentioned a long list of places where Missionaries are greatly needed, and might be eminently useful. He first instanced the Armenians; a very efficient people, about 600,000 in number, among whom two Missionaries would find abundant employment; and as many of them are merchants, travelling often as far as India for purposes of business, the good seed placed in their hands, might be scattered far and wide. Among the Syrian Christians in Mesopotamia, about 200,000 in number, 2 Missionaries are greatly needed. In Persia, near the head of the Gulph, 2 Missionaries. In Grand Cairo (Egypt) 2; in Jerusalem, which he said was a dangerous place, but should not be abandoned, 2; in Joppa, from which access could be had to all the land of the Philistines, 2; in Samaria, 1 or 2; in Cana of Galilee, which he thought a very desirable station, 1; in Mount Anti-Libanus, 1; in a village between Damascus and Aleppo, 2; among the Ansaries 2, one of whom should be a physician; among the Druses on Mount Lebanon, about 75,000 in number, 2, one of whom should be a physician; at or near Antioch, 2; at Tarsus, the birth place of Saul, 1 or 2; at Philadelphia, the site of one of the Apocalyptic Churches, 1 or 2. Smyrna, he said, was a very important station, and already partially occupied. Missionaries should also be stationed at Constantinople, or at some point on the Dardanelles, perhaps near the site of ancient Troy. In the Barbary States were mentioned, among other locations, Tunis, Algiers, Fez and Tripoli. Nor must Greece be forgotten in these benevolent labors; and no Missionaries would be so favorably received among them as Americans.

Mr. King added some remarks, showing the obligations of this country, and especially of this city, to do much in supplying these necessities; and spoke of the influence which a noble example here, would have upon England, France, and other countries. The meeting was then addressed by the Rev. Dr. Beecher, of Boston. He said, the time for the conversion of the world, would depend very much upon the choice of Christians. The prophecies which were to precede this event were all fulfilled, and it now seemed to be said to Christians, "Be it unto thee even as thou wilt." He alluded to the favorable changes which have taken place in the world within the last 50 or 100 years, particularly in the decline of Idolatry, Mahomedanism and Popery; all of which, though still formidable, he considered to be essentially weakened. Christians, he said, were beginning to awake; and should they continue to double their exertions every few years, as of late they had done, it would not be long before the work would be accomplished. It was not necessary to send out a minister to every 1000 people of the Pagan world,—this would be impossible. It was only needful to plant the Christian standard among them here and there,—and ere long a company of ministers would be trained up on missionary ground. But thus much must be done; and now is the time—"we are the people." He then spoke of the obligations of the American people to embark in the missionary work. We are the first nation, he said, that ever was truly free. Other republics have either contained the elements of despotism within themselves, or been surrounded by despotic governments which kept them in awe. But we have never been in bondage to any man. Even the taxes of European governments, from which Americans are exempt, would carry a knowledge of the Gospel through the world.—In conclusion, he spoke of the re-action of benevolent efforts upon ourselves; of the revivals which usually follow in their train; of the necessity of keeping alive the spirit of benevolent exertion, in order to the security of our civil and religious liberty, &c. &c.

It had been stated by Mr. Evarts, in the course of his remarks, that in order to establish the several Missions contemplated by the Board, not less than $100,000 would be necessary, in addition to the usual receipts. At the close of the addresses, a gentleman well known in the annals of benevolence in this city, but who has particularly requested that his name may not be published, remarked that if $100,000 was needed for so good an object, it must be had; and that he would himself stand responsible for $5000. A gentleman from Rochester, expressed his belief that the stock would be popular in that vicinity, and pledged himself either to collect or give $10,000. Six other gentlemen subscribed $1000 each, and several clergymen of the city united in making up another $1000. There were two subscriptions of $500 each, one of $400, one of $300, three of $200, ten of $100, and other smaller sums to the amount of $375. Total, $25,675.

The question being asked, how many of the subscribers would consider their donations annual for the term of five years, on condition that *within twelve months the sum should be raised to One Hundred Thousand Dollars a year for the same period*, the donors of $20,675 assented. Making the total of subscriptions pledged to Foreign Missions in a single evening by a small number of our citizens and one liberal gentleman from abroad, ONE HUNDRED AND EIGHT THOUSAND, THREE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-FIVE DOLLARS.

THE

CHRISTIAN MAGAZINE.

VOL. IV. DECEMBER, 1827. No. 12.

For the Christian Magazine.

REMARKS ON THE HISTORY OF HAMAN.

AHASUERUS promoted Haman, "and advanced him, and set his seat above all the princes, that were with him. All the king's servants, that were in the king's gate, bowed and reverenced Haman; for the king had so commanded concerning him." One, however, there was, who neither bowed, nor did him reverence. It was Mordecai the Jew. On discovering this, Haman was full of wrath. But, scorning to lay hands on Mordecai alone, he obtained a decree from Ahasuerus, that all the Jews, who were then, in great numbers, dispersed throughout the kingdom, should be put to death on the thirteenth day of the twelfth month. Soon after this decree had been issued, Esther the queen, for a special purpose, invited the king and Haman to a banquet, that she proposed to prepare for them. On the appointed day, Haman set out to go to her banquet with joy and gladness of heart. But, when he had arrived at the king's gate, he there saw Mordecai, who neither stood up, nor moved for him. On this account he was filled with indignation. Nevertheless, he refrained himself, and went in to the banquet. But, on returning home, he spake to his friends concerning the multitude of his children, and his riches, and his honors, and the fact of his being alone with the king invited to the banquet of the queen; yet, added, that all this could avail him nothing, so long as he should see Mordecai the Jew sitting at the king's gate. With a view to gratify his malevolence, his friends advised him to have a gallows erected before his own door, fifty cubits high, and to present a petition to the king, which they doubted not would be granted him, that Mordecai might be hanged thereon the next morning. "The thing pleased Haman, and he caused the gallows to be made." Very early the next morning, he proceeded to the king's palace. But, before he could present to him the petition, that has been mentioned, Ahasuerus asked him, what should be done to the man, whom the king delighted to honor. Supposing himself to be intended, he replied, that one of the king's most noble princes should array that man in the royal apparel, and set him on the horse, which the king was accustomed to ride, and, going with him through the city, should proclaim before him, "Thus shall it be done unto the man, whom the king delighteth to honor." Immediately Ahasuerus commanded him to hasten, and do thus unto Mordecai. Th

command he obeyed; and then, "hasted to his house, mourning, and having his head uncovered," where his friends predicted his utter ruin. There he remained, till the king's chamberlains came and hastened him to Esther's banquet. At this banquet, she made request of the king for her own life, and the life of her people, the Jews, in the kingdom, who were all under the sentence of death. Probably forgetting the decree, which, he had signed at the request of Haman, Ahasuerus, with surprise, asked her,—"Who is he? and where is he, that durst presume in his heart to do so? And Esther said, the adversary and enemy is this wicked Haman." Exasperated by this information, the king rose up from the banquet, and hastened into his palace garden. But, soon returning, he found Haman in a situation, which the more excited his indignation toward him. Then "Harbonah, one of the king's chamberlain's, said before the king, Behold, also, the gallows, fifty cubits high, which Haman had made for Mordecai, standeth in the house of Haman. Then the king said, hang him thereon. So they hanged Haman on the gallows, that he had prepared for Mordecai." And thus terminated the earthly career of that bitter enemy of the Jews. His history is replete with instruction, and naturally suggests the following observations.

1. Riches, and honors, and pleasures, cannot, of themselves, render men happy. Haman was a man of *wealth*. He spake to his friends concerning the glory of his riches, and he promised to present to Ahasuerus ten thousand talents of silver as an inducement to him to promulgate a decree for the extermination of his Jewish subjects. He was an *honored* man. The king promoted him, and advanced him, and set him above all the princes, that were with him; and all the king's servants bowed and reverenced Haman. Thus rich and honored, he could freely indulge himself in *worldly pleasure*. And are you ready to conclude, that he must have been one of the happiest of men? The fact is far otherwise. He was wretched. He cherished a disposition, that would have rendered him unhappy under any possible circumstances in life. Mordecai bowed not, nor did him reverence. This he could not endure. He calls together his friends, and tells them of the glory of his riches, and of the multitude of his children, and of all things, wherein the king has promoted him, and how he has advanced him above all the servants of the king, and how Esther did let no man but him come in with the king to her banquet, and how he is invited to go in with the king to her banquet on the morrow. "Yet," adds he, "all this availeth me nothing, so long as I see Mordecai the Jew, sitting at the king's gate." Thus, you learn, that riches, and honors, and pleasures, cannot of themselves make men happy.

2. Those, who cherish a discontented spirit, will always find something to destroy their peace. Such a spirit seems to have been naturally possessed and cherished by Haman. And, in consequence of possessing and cherishing it, his peace was destroyed. There seems to have been, at all times, something, by which it was disturbed. The little affront, that he received from Mordecai, withered all his joys. He confessed, that his estates, his preferments, and his family, could afford him no

enjoyment, so long as the hated Jew was permitted to sit in the king's gate. There are those now, whose peace is destroyed by a discontented spirit. However agreeable and desirable their circumstances may appear to others, they are themselves discontented and unhappy. They are ever ready to entertain you with the recital of a long catalogue of circumstances, by which they suffered their peace to be disturbed. In short, there is always some Mordecai sitting in the king's gate; and they are free to confess, that, so long as he is permitted to remain there, their temporal circumstances, how agreeable soever in themselves, can avail them nothing. Certain, therefore, it is, that in this sinful world, a discontented spirit will always find something to destroy the peace of its possessor. There are, in the domestic circle, and in the neighbourhood, and in the church, and in the religious society, events of very frequent occurrence, which are in themselves disagreeable. And if, overlooking the many pleasing circumstances of our situation, we suffer our minds almost constantly to fix on the, perhaps, comparatively few disagreeable circumstances, in which we may be placed, we shall not only render ourselves wretched, but also disturb the happiness of those, with whom we are connected. Besides, to cherish a discontented spirit, is sinful in the sight of God. Extending, as do his counsel and agency, to the most minute circumstances and events, we cannot cherish such a spirit, without murmuring against him on account of the allotments of his providence. Let us rather imbibe and cherish the spirit of Paul, who knew both how to be abased, and how to abound; and who learned, in whatever circumstances he was placed, therewith to be content.

3. What will a spirit of supreme selfishness do, when not subjected to restraint. Haman thought it beneath him to sacrifice Mordecai alone; and, therefore, deliberately resolved to destroy all the Jews, that were scattered throughout the kingdom of Persia, and actually obtained of Ahasuerus a decree for this purpose. The Jews were then extremely numerous in that kingdom. Yet, they were all, both old and young, both women and little children, devoted to utter destruction, to gratify Haman's proud, revengeful, selfish spirit. With what a humiliating picture of the natural heart are we here presented. In it we may see what supreme selfishness will do, when unrestrained. A disposition, like his, would stop at nothing, but would sacrifice upon the altar of revenge every thing, by which it should chance to be crossed. It would not stop till, having dethroned Jehovah, and seated itself in his place, it could brood, with malignant pleasure, over the ruins of a desolated universe. How odious in the sight of heaven must such a spirit appear. Escape from it, as you would escape from the deadly pestilence. See, that your hearts are brought under the influence of that universal and impartial benevolence, which "seeketh not her own."

4. Those, who admire and flatter themselves, practise upon themselves a gross deception. Haman admired and flattered himself on account of the distinguished honor, which Esther conferred upon him, in that she invited him alone, of all the princes of the king, to her royal banquets. He supposed, that she repeatedly in-

vited him, because she was charmed with his company, and especially delighted to honor him, and deemed none so worthy, as himself, to associate with herself and the king. But, how greatly did the pride of his heart deceive him. Instead of inviting him to her banquets for the reasons, which he supposed, she did it for the purpose of accusing him, to the king; and, in summoning him to her feasts, she did but summon him to the bar of justice.

His disposition to admire and flatter himself, again deceived him, when in answer to the king's inquiry, he promptly declared what should be done to the man, whom the king delighted to honor. So exalted an opinion did he entertain respecting himself, that he at once concluded, he must be the person intended. But, how painfully was he undeceived, when Ahasuerus commanded him to hasten and honor Mordecai in the manner which he had described. Self-admirers and self-flatterers are, therefore, self-deceivers. Others do not hold them in so high estimation, as they fondly imagine. They commonly speak much in commendation of themselves, and they seem to suppose, that those, to whom they address themselves, entertain a more favorable opinion concerning them on account of that praise, which they lavish on themselves. But they could not be more deceived. No man, by praising himself, ever raised himself in the estimation of others. On the contrary, to hear a man, under the influence of a self-flattering spirit, speaking flippantly in commendation of himself, fills the breast of every modest, sensible person, with disgust, if not with indignation. Guard, then, against manifesting that spirit, which is now the subject of reprehension. If you *have* any real excellencies of character, they will, generally, be perceived and be duly appreciated. And if they are not, you can never cause them to be perceived and appreciated by publishing them on the house-top, or in the corners of the streets. Besides, to cherish a spirit of self-admiration and self-flattery, is highly offensive to God. He knows, that you have nothing, on account of which you have occasion to be elevated in your own estimation; but that you have reason to lie low before him in the valley of humiliation.

5. The history of Haman suggests the remark, that the pride of all men must, sooner or later, be humbled. How effectually humbled was the proud, insolent, haughty, overbearing spirit, of which he was naturally possessed. The very morning, on which he had hoped to behold Mordecai extended on a gibbet, he received a positive order from his sovereign to clothe the hated Jew in the royal apparel, to place him on the royal steed, and, going with him through the streets of the city, to proclaim before him, —"Thus shall it be done unto the man, whom the king delighteth to honor." This was more than his proud heart could endure. It effectually humbled his haughty spirit. Having his head uncovered, he hastened to his house, mourning, and made his friends acquainted with all that had befallen him. Even so must the pride of all men, sooner or later, be, by one method or another, effectually humbled. The pen of inspiration has recorded that the loftiness of man shall be bowed down, and the haughtiness of men shall be made low; that God will cause the arrogancy of the proud

to cease, and will lay low the haughtiness of the terrible. This is done in every instance of a man's becoming a real Christian. Humility is an indispensable trait of christian character. It is impossible for a man to be a real Christian, and still to retain all the natural pride, and stubbornness, and wilfulness of his heart. These, though not totally eradicated, have received a wound from which they will not be able wholly to recover. How desirable, that the pride of all should, in this manner, be humbled in the present world. If it is not, it must be humbled in a far different manner in the world to come.

6. Read in the history of Haman the doom of all the incorrigible enemies of the church. The Jews did, at that time, constitute the only visible people of God upon earth. In hating and persecuting Mordecai and the Jews, Haman, therefore, hated and persecuted the church of God. And, on that very account, his conduct was peculiarly offensive to God. His hatred and persecution of the church was his most aggravated and provoking crime; and, on this account, that God, to whom vengeance belongeth, brought upon him an exemplary punishment. On the very gibbet, which he had erected for Mordecai, he was himself executed. In like manner, have the enemies of the church been often taken in their own craftiness, and snared in the work of their own hands. Beware, then, how you are found acting against the church of the living God. No weapon, that is raised against it, will be suffered finally to prosper. It is founded on a rock; that rock is Christ; and against that rock the gates of hell can never prevail. "Why do the heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing? He, that sitteth in the heavens, shall laugh; the Lord shall have them in derision. He shall speak to them in his wrath, and vex them in his sore displeasure. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel. Be wise now, therefore, O ye kings; be instructed, ye judges of the earth. Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little." F.

For the Christian Magazine.

EXPOSITION OF PHILIP. iii. 8—11.

"Yea doubtless, and I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord: for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dross that I may win Christ, and be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith. *that I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable to his death; if by any means I might obtain unto the resurrection of the dead.*"

It is the last verse of this passage, which is the special object of the present article. "If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead."

Resurrection from the dead, is spoken of in the Bible, in three different senses. 1. As expressing generally the resurrection both of the just and unjust. 2. As meaning particularly, the resurrection of the saints in the likeness of Christ's glorious body. And 3, as denoting simply *resurrection to spiritual life*, which begins at conversion, and ends with perfection in holiness.

The resurrection spoken of in the text, it is plain, cannot be

the *general resurrection;* for the apostle could not have been any way solicitous as to attaining unto this, since he knew it to be settled with certainty by the decree of God, that "*all* who will be in their graves, shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and come forth."

Nor, as will appear in the sequel, can this resurrection be the resurrection of the saints in the likeness of Christ's glorious body; although the attainment of this might have been to the apostle's mind an object of great solicitude.

This resurrection mentioned in our text can be no other than a *spiritual resurrection.* For this the apostle's deep solicitude seems altogether proper, inasmuch as a *spiritual resurrection* is a matter of immediate obligation, connected with our own voluntary agency, and is indispensable to our eternal happiness.

For the position which I have now taken, my

First Reason is found *in the connexion of the text with the preceeding verse.*

In this the apostle speaks of the process of sanctification, or of the means by which this work is carried forward; and in our particular text he presents the immediate result, or accomplishment of this work. His words are, "That I may know him (Christ, i. e. the Christian religion, both theoretically and practically) and the power of his resurrection, (i. e. the like power exerted in me to raise me to spiritual life, as was exerted to raise him to a new and heavenly life,) and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable to his death, (i. e. experiencing those mortifications of the flesh, and that dying unto sin, which correspond to that he underwent for sin.)

Now comes the clause, which I am endeavoring particularly to explain. "*If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead,*" i. e. rise from that state of degradation and spiritual death into which sin has brought me, to a state of complete sanctification—a state of spiritual life —of perfect conformity to the divine image—a state like that in which man originally was, and in which all moral beings are bound to live forever.

My Second Reason for such an interpretation, *is found in the three verses which follow the text.* In these, the apostle proceeds to say, that he did not consider himself to have, as yet, attained; viz. unto this resurrection; thereby implying that he thought it attainable, or considered himself as being under obligations to attain unto it, even in this life. "Not," says he, "as though I had already attained, either were already perfect, but I follow after, if that I may apprehend that (he means *perfection in holiness*) for which I was apprehended by Christ Jesus (viz. at his conversion.) He proceeds then to say; "yes, brethren, whatever claims others may make, I do not count myself to have as yet reached a state of perfection; but this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those which are before, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus," i. e. I press on towards higher attainments in the divine life.

Such must be the import of these passages; for to make the general resurrection, or the resurrection of the saints in the likeness of Christ's glorious body, to be the great object, which the apostle here counts himself not

to have apprehended, would be to make him gravely say, that he did not yet count himself to be dead, nor regard himself as having yet arrived at the last great day when the bodies of all shall be raised, but that he was urging on with all his might toward these things.

My Third Reason is, that the text thus explained *accords with other parts of Paul's writings, especially with the sixth chapter of his epistle to the Romans.* There, in answer to the objection, that justification by free grace would give a license to sin, the apostle proceeds to show explicitly, that Christians by their profession of the religion of Christ, were under obligations to be dead with Christ, as to the old man, and to be risen with Christ, as to the new man, i. e. to be holy. "Know ye not," says he, "that as many of us as have been baptized into Jesus Christ, have been baptized into his death? (i. e. have engaged by baptism to imitate him in his death, by dying unto sin, as he died for sin.) Therefore we have been buried with him by baptism into death, so that as Christ was raised from the dead by the power of the Father, we also should lead a new life;" i. e. as we have professed to be dead with Christ, so we have professed to be alive with him; or in other words to be risen to a new and holy life, as he rose to a new and heavenly life.

The apostle having thus shown what was the *profession* of Christians, he proceeds to exhort them to be in very deed what they professed to be, viz. dead to sin, and alive to God. "For," continues he, "we know that Christ, being risen from the dead, dieth no more, for in respect to his death, he died for sin once for all; but in respect to his life, he liveth unto God. So also," continues he, "should you account yourselves as being dead unto sin, but alive unto God with Jesus Christ:" (i. e. you ought once for all, and that even now, to become dead as to the old man, and wholly alive as to the new man.) He proceeds, "therefore, let not sin reign in your mortal body so as to obey its lusts; neither yield your members to sin, as instruments of iniquity, but give up yourselves to God, as alive from the dead, and yield your members to God, as instruments of righteousness; for sin must not reign over you, although you are not under the law, but under grace." Such is the apostle's exhortation; and the accordance of our text as above explained, with the portion of Scripture just recited, is manifest, and may be represented by stating the following particulars.

1. As the apostle had not, when he wrote our text, attained unto complete resurrection to spiritual life, but considered himself as being under obligations so to do, having been apprehended by Christ Jesus for this very purpose, so the Christians at Rome are represented by Paul not as having already risen with Christ to a perfectly holy life, but as being under obligations so to do by their baptism into Christ.

2. As the apostle makes mention in our text of the power of Christ's resurrection, or that power which raised Christ to a heavenly life, as the grand means by which he hoped to rise to a holy life; so it is implied in the other passage recited, that the Christians at Rome were to rise from the dead by the same power, for it is said in respect to them, that like as Christ was raised up

from the dead by the power of the Father, even so they also should walk in newness of life.

3. As the apostle was pressing forward toward perfection in holiness, as if that state were attainable in this life; so the Christians at Rome are exhorted to yield themselves unto God as those that are alive from the dead, i. e. to advance onward to a state of perfect holiness, as if that state were attainable in the present life.

One other passage I may just advert to, which will cast light upon our text. Paul says to the Ephesians, "you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins." Here it is certain that the idea of resurrection stands for that of *spiritual life.*

So do I feel constrained to explain our text. It is a moral resurrection after which the apostle is striving, and unto which he hopes to attain.

It is plainly a resurrection attainable in the present life; and therefore neither the general resurrection of all, nor the particular resurrection of the saints, to which the apostle alludes.

J. M.

For the Christian Magazine.

MR. BALFOUR'S OPINION OF THE DEVIL, CARRIED OUT.

Messrs. Editors,

MR. BALFOUR, having shown at length, what is, and what is not meant by the term *Satan*, proceeds, Sec. vi. p. 116, to give his "opinion" respecting "the original term *Diabolos*, or devil." After quoting himself and Doctor Campbell on several passages, and taking notice of various passages where the term devil is used *figuratively*, he goes on to cite John, xiii. 2. "And supper being ended, (the devil having now put it into the heart of Judas Iscariot, Simon's son to betray him.") Here Mr. B. again refers *us* to *himself*, on a parallel passage, and of course, we refer *him* to *ourselves*, on the same, in our last number. In this passage our readers will doubtless recollect, that Mr. B.'s devil is not only extremely *metaphysical*, but one devil enters into Judas to execute another devil. (See Magazine for Sept. pp. 171, 172.) The next passage worthy of notice, where the term devil is used literally, is, 1 Peter, v. 8, 9. "Be sober, be vigilant, because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour: whom resist steadfast in the faith, knowing that the same afflictions are accomplished in your brethren that are in the world." Here Mr. B. says, p. 120, "It is confidently believed by many good people, that this devil who walketh about like a roaring lion, is a fallen angel or malignant spirit. But I ask, how is such a belief to be reconciled with his having his abode in hell, with some in the air, and others, his tempting men in all parts of the earth at the same time? Such a belief is contrary to all facts and experience. Did ever any person see the devil in the shape of a lion, hear him roar, or is an instance on record in the history of mankind of one being devoured by him? Such idle, childish stories have been told of the devil, but what man in our day gives the least credit to them?" After this taunt, and a long and labored criticism, Mr. B. comes to the conclusion, that devil here means the persecuting Jews. The passage therefore, according to Mr. B. ought to stand thus: 'Be sober, be vigilant, because your

adversary, "the persecuting Jews," as a roaring lion walketh about, seeking whom *he* may devour.' "But I ask, how is such a belief to be reconciled" 'with the Jews having their abode at Jerusalem, with some, that the devil is "the principle of evil personified," and even with Mr. B. himself, that the devil was Judas's "*fixed determination immediately to execute his purpose?*" "Such a belief is contrary to all facts and experience." 'Did ever any person see either of these devils "in the shape of a lion, hear him roar, or is an instance on record in the history of mankind of one being devoured by him?" "Such idle and childish stories" are repeatedly told by Mr. B. and by other Unitarian, Universalist and infidel writers;* but what man, who believes the Bible, "gives the least credit to them?"

John, viii. 44. "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do: he was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him: when he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar and the father of it." On this passage, after quoting and misapplying Rev. Prof. Stuart, (who, by the way, proves nothing to Mr. B.'s purpose,) Mr. B. finally concludes, that devil, here referred to, means "*lust.*" So we have it: 'Ye are of your father the lust, and the lusts of the lust ye will do: lust was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When lust speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for lust is a liar and the father of it.'

* See "Volney's Ruins," Sermons by Rev. Henry Ware, Jr. Kneeland, and other writers of the same cast.

We may remark here, however, that our Saviour is addressing those very "persecuting Jews," whom Mr. B. in other places, calls the devil and satan. Now as these Jews were of their father the "lust," it seems that one devil begot another devil, who went about like a roaring lion, seeking whom he might devour. We may be assured, therefore, that Mr. B. not only teaches the true "doctrine of devils," but gives us the history of the whole progeny in chronological order. But in order to enjoy a little more light on this subject, we will endeavor once more to open our understandings to Mr. B.'s *metaphysics*. It is evident that the Jews must have *lusted*, before their lusts could have had any influence. This appears from Mr. B.'s own declarations. For, in order to illustrate his comment upon this passage, he proceeds to quote our Saviour's address to the Jews, "Ye do the deeds of your father." "What father?" asks Mr. B. "What they had seen or learned from their own evil lusts or passions." p. 132. According to this, the Jews must have begotten their lusts, and their lusts must have begotten the Jews. So we may read: 'Ye are of your father your lusts, and the lusts of your lusts ye will do: your lusts *was* a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in your lusts. When your lusts *speaketh* a lie, *he* speaketh of his own: for your lusts *is* a liar and the father of it.' Surely Solomon did not live in *our* day. He declared, that "there is no new thing under the sun." But if his happy lot had been cast in these days of "interpretation," he might learn from Mr. B. that the parents begot the children,

and the children begot the parents.

1 John, iii. 8, 9, 10. "He that committeth sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning. For this cause the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil. Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him; and he cannot sin, because he is born of God. In this the children of God are manifest and the children of the devil: whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God, neither he that loveth not his brother." Here Mr. B. says, p. 134, "This, and the preceding passage, were written by the same person. The language and sentiment are both similar, and the quotations and remarks made, are applicable to both." So let us read: 'He that committeth sin is of the lust; for the lust sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the lust. Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God. In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the lust.'

Hebrews, ii. 14, 15. "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them, who, through fear of death, were all their lifetime subject to bondage." In commenting on this passage, Mr. B. in one place, makes the term devil mean *the law;* in another, *the law and sin;* and in the third, *the law, sin and lust.* pp. 137—140. We have, therefore, according to Mr. B. these three different readings; and which is the most agreeable to [illegible] let common sense judge. 'Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is *the law.*' —'Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, '*the law and sin..*'—'Forsamuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is *the law, sin and lust.*' Mr. B. it seems, being a Universalist, is determined that *Christ shall destroy the law;* although Christ expressly declares, "I came not to *destroy* the law or the prophets."

Acts, xiii. 10. "O full of all subtilty, and all mischief, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness; will thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?" In this passage Mr. B. makes "child of the devil," mean "slanderous person." p. 140. Paul should have said, therefore, 'O full of all subtilty and all mischief, thou "slanderous person," thou enemy of all righteousness; wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?' Had Mr. B. been scribe to the apostle Paul, instead of "the beloved physician," the Christian world would not so long have labored under such a sad mistake, as to suppose that there is really such a *being* as "the old serpent, who is the devil and Satan;" and the "doctrine of

devils" would have been clearly taught eighteen hundred years ago.

Matt. xiii. 39. "The enemy that sowed them is the devil, the harvest is the end of the world; and the reapers are the angels." Here Mr. B. says, p. 141, "what then is meant by the devil that sowed the tares? In the Second Inquiry we have shown, that the tares were the unbelieving Jews, who at the end of the world or age were destroyed. Well, what devil sowed them? The same devil or satan that put it into the heart of Judas to betray Christ." But Mr. B. told us, p. 105, that the devil or satan which put it into the heart of Judas to betray Christ, was, "his *fixed determination immediately to execute his purpose.*" The whole passage, then, to obtain the true "*sense*," must stand thus: 'The field is the world: the good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are "the unbelieving Jews;" the enemy that sowed them, "the unbelieving Jews," is Judas' "*fixed determination immediately to execute his purpose.*"' Mr. B. however adds, in contradiction to what he had just stated, that "no other devil was required to produce a crop of tares or wicked men, but the evil principles of their own hearts, for they were of their father the devil, and the lusts of their father they did." To quote him fairly, therefore, we have another rendering. 'The field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the unbelieving Jews; the enemy that sowed "the unbelieving Jews" is "the evil principles of their own hearts." Thus Mr. B. renders the exposition of our Saviour, and lets in "a flood of light." For he continues to teach us, that the 'Jews were of their father the lust, and the lusts of their lust they would do.'

Matt. xxv. 41. "Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." In this passage, pp. 141, 142, Mr. B. thinks that devil means "the unbelieving, persecuting Jews." (Doubtless they were those devils who were of their father the lust.) The verse then should stand thus: 'Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for "the unbelieving, persecuting Jews" and *his* angels.'

In the remaining passages expounded in this section, Mr. B. makes no advances, but merely repeats, in substance, what he has said before; except in one or two instances, where he sets aside the Scripture account altogether, and follows the track of Mr. Volney, and other infidel writers, who seem best to furnish him with matter and argument. It is unnecessary therefore to follow him any farther in his interpretations, until we come to consider his exposition of those passages, where the terms devil and satan are used synonymously. This, by leave of Providence, we shall do in a future number. In the mean time we need not marvel that Mr. B. has been somewhat given to *change*, since he has been so much harassed with "lust," the "love of money," "fixed determinations" to bring himself before the publick, and many other devils of which we cannot now speak particularly. We confess, however, that it is not a little surprising, how Mr. B. should be able to make such a display of profound erudition in the oriental languages, while the translators of our English version were such

mere blockheads and gross pedants. But such things have happened before; and even a pedagogue would stand pre-eminently learned, in the midst of gaping rusticks, while

"—still they gazed, and still the wonder grew,
That one small head could carry all he knew."

MATHETES.

From the Utica Christian Repository.

THE PILGRIM'S PROGRESS IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.—BY BUNYANUS.

CHAPTER XXI.

By this time the day was far spent, and the travellers began to wish for a place of entertainment, where they might obtain a lodging for the night, and such refreshments as they needed after the fatigues of the day; and lifting up their eyes they saw, at a little distance before them, a house which they imagined to be the same which was kept by Gaius, when Christiana and her company passed this way, and which had long been a noted place for the entertainment of pilgrims. As they drew nearer, they were confirmed in their opinion by seeing what appeared to be an ancient edifice, though many parts of it seemed to have been newly repaired, and there were additions to it in more modern style for the accommodation of the numerous customers who appeared to resort thither. As they approached, the master of the house came out to meet them, and very courteously invited them to walk in, saying, the good of the house is before you. Thoughtful and Ardent, remembering how they had been deceived at the pretended house Beautiful, paused at the door to make some inquiries; but the rest of the company entered without hesitation. Then said the Master of the house,

Walk in, friends, walk in; why do you hesitate?

Th. We wish to know who keeps this house, and to be assured that it is one which was erected by the Lord of the way for the accommodation of pilgrims. We had supposed that it was the same house which was formerly kept by Gaius; but many things about it seem to have a new appearance.

Master. It is the same house, only repaired and enlarged for the better accommodation of the greater number of travellers in our happy times. My name is *Liberal.* I am a lineal descendant of Gaius, "the host *of the* church." I commend your caution, and to give you evidence of the truth of what I say, I will produce the records of the house, by which you will see that it is the same.

So saying he stepped in and brought out to them the records of the house, a venerable *looking* volume, and showed *them* the original charter, sealed with the King's seal, together with the rules and regulations of the house, and turned to the record which was made of the worthy pilgrims who had formerly been entertained there. Having seen these things, the pilgrims had no longer any doubts that this was, indeed, the same house which Gaius had formerly kept. So, being weary with their journey, they entered, without further inquiry, and were shown into the room where their fellow travellers were already seated. Then the master of the house, having ordered refreshments to be provided, sat down with his guests, and they entered into the following discourse:

Liberal. I am very happy to see you here; and it is not the least among the gratifying circum-

stances to see you travelling together, as true pilgrims ought to do. I perceive, indeed, by your garments being not all made in the same fashion, that you are not all called by the same name. And the time has been, when probably you would have sought different houses of entertainment, and when perhaps some of you would not readily have been received at this house. But I rejoice that we live in a more liberal age, when true pilgrims of every name can meet together in the same house, and sit down at the same table, without any of those jealous feelings which formerly served to keep them asunder.

Feel-well. It is very gratifying to me to see union among brethren. We are, indeed, called by different names, and we differ in our views about many things of minor importance; but there is not one of the company but what I embrace as a true brother pilgrim.

Love-self. These are my sentiments too; and I rejoice to find a house of entertainment where the same principles are avowed.

No-law. I agree with my brethren who have spoken. We have found such houses before; but we have not before had the pleasure of being all together at the same house.

Th. I must confess that I am not prepared to express full confidence in every man that I see with a pilgrim's coat on; nor to account those points on which we differ, as points of minor importance. But having seen the charter and rules of this house, and cordially approving of them, I have come to seek for entertainment where my ancestors have found it before me.

Ard. I love to see brotherly love and union among true pilgrims. These who love the Lord of the way, ought to love one another. But I suppose this does not oblige us to acknowledge as his true friends those whom he refuses to acknowledge.

Lib. That is true. But there is certainly something very pleasant in thinking of others as favorably as we can. And for my part, I am not disposed to be very particular with respect to those I entertain. If a stranger comes to my house, and calls himself a pilgrim, I am unwilling to be suspicious of him, and by a severe scrutiny to give him reason to believe that I am disposed to think every man an impostor. I am rather disposed to treat every man as if I thought him honest, till he proves himself otherwise.

F. w. Amen. That is what I like.

Th. I do not perceive that you make any inquiries, or take any pains to ascertain the character of those who come. You invited us all at first sight, without even inquiring whether we had letters of introduction from any proper source.

Lib. You come in the character of pilgrims, and I know of no reason to doubt but that you are what you profess. You come only to be entertained for a night, ready to depart on the morrow. Had you come to offer yourselves for admittance into the family, to become stated residents among us, the case would be different. I should then look at your letters of introduction, with which I doubt not you are all furnished.

Th. You hinted that formerly it would have been matter of doubt whether we should all have been received at this house, even for occasional entertainment. On what account was it?

Lib. Formerly pilgrims of different denominations had not such

liberal feelings towards each other as they have now; and a greater degree of agreement in their views, both of doctrines and duties, was thought necessary, in order to their coming into the same house, and sitting down at the same table. The followers of John the Itinerant and the followers of John of Geneva could by no means consent to walk together. But I rejoice that such narrow prejudices are giving way.

Th. Would both be admitted together as members of your family, if they were disposed?

Lib. Certainly. I should think it inconsistent to admit any as occasional guests that we should be unwilling to admit as permanent members of the house, if they were disposed.

Th. But, do you suppose the followers of John the Itinerant would consent to the charter and rules of this house, which you showed me?

Lib. Probably not, without some latitude of interpretation. But we do not, any longer, make a full consent to them a term of admission. If we obtain satisfactory evidence that they are true pilgrims, we do not think it necessary to require them fully to consent to those rules, in every particular. This house is not *ours*, but our Lord's; and the table we spread is not *our* table, but his. And we should think we did wrong to hinder any from coming to it whom he receives.

Th. You appear to take it for granted that he does receive those who do not consent to the rules which he has established; which ought not to be taken for granted, without proof. The fact, that it is the Lord's table and not *ours*, would lead me to a conclusion the reverse of that which you appear to draw. If it were ours, we might admit whom we pleased. But as it is his, we have no right to admit any but such as he directs us to admit. He has informed us that he has provided it for his friends; and he has given us marks by which we are to try the pretensions of those who claim to be such. We are not at liberty, therefore, to admit any to his table, but those who give us credible evidence that they are his friends. You seem, however, to ask for no evidence at all, unless the mere circumstance of our appearing in the pilgrim's dress is evidence. But it is plain that this is no evidence whatever; for we are required to beware of wolves in sheep's clothing, and are distinctly forewarned that in these days there will be many deceivers. And among the marks he has given us, by which to detect such, none is more clear than their disposition to receive or reject his instructions. It is written, "He that is of God, heareth God's words; ye, therefore, hear them not, because ye are not of God." Also, "If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed; for he that biddeth him God speed, is partaker of his evil deeds."

Lib. We consider that the cordial reception of any one truth is evidence of friendship to our Lord. And we practice upon the command of the apostle, "him that is weak in the faith, receive ye: but not to doubtful disputations."

Th. I believe also that the cordial reception of any one truth of the gospel, when fully understood, is evidence of friendship to our Lord; because it is connected with the cordial reception of

every other truth as soon as it is clearly seen. The same heart that approves of one will approve of all. And the converse of this, I also believe, that the understanding and cordial rejection of any one truth, is evidence of the want of friendship to him. But I had not thought there was any thing embraced in the charter and rules of this house which you would consider matters of doubtful disputation, or which can be regarded otherwise than as fundamental parts of the system of divine truth. If they are truths, they must be fundamental truths; and if they are not truths, but errors, they must be fundamental errors. If any thing can be fundamental in the system of divine truth, it appears to me that those things which enter into the nature of christian experience must be so. But upon all those things, the followers of John the Itinerant differ from me totally, and from the articles of this house. That which I believe to be true religion, they reject, as not entering at all into its nature; and that which they believe to be true religion, I reject as not entering at all into its nature. One or the other of us must be in a fundamental error.

Lib. I do not wish to condemn either of you. I hope you are both right in all that is essential. And I do not consider so many things essential, as you appear to do. It is impossible to make men agree in every thing, and if we should confine ourselves rigidly to our articles, and receive none but such as embraced them, in the same sense, we should have but a very small family.

Th. I had supposed it were better to have a few that were agreed, than to have many who were not agreed. It is written, "How can two walk together, except they be agreed?"

Lib. True; but we find no difficulty. We agree to differ. Those points on which pilgrims differ, we agree to let alone. And so, we are entirely harmonious, and have a very full house, which we could not have on any other principles.

Th. It is enjoined upon pilgrims to "contend earnestly for the faith which was once delivered to the saints," and which is contained in the articles of this house. How is it consistent with that command, to agree to let alone all those points upon which professed pilgrims differ?

Lib. Disputes and contentions are what we are not fond of; and we think the circumstances of the times are such, that it is not our duty to contend for every particular. The pilgrim world are now engaging in great enterprizes for advancing the kingdom of their Lord; and as many hands must be called to the work, we feel it of great importance to cultivate a spirit of harmony and good feeling among all denominations, that this great and good work may not be hindered.

Th. Those enterprizes have for their professed object the spread of the gospel. Now, it is the gospel itself which is sent forth, or it is something else under that name. If it is something else under the name of the gospel, that is sent forth, how can it be desirable that great numbers should unite in sending forth that which is not the gospel, but a system of error? If it is the gospel itself, that is sent forth, how can it be expected that those who neither believe nor love the gospel, will give their aid in spreading it? Surely, those, and those only, who believe and love the

gospel, can be depended upon for their cordial and permanent aid in spreading it abroad. And if so, the way to provide permanent friends to the work is not by being silent about it at home, and quietly suffering error to creep in and occupy its place, as it will, if it is let alone. On the contrary, people must be instructed, and taught to understand, to believe, and love the gospel; and then they can be depended upon, as permanent friends to the work. Besides, it is well known that other denominations have their own institutions for the propagation of their own principles; and it cannot be expected that they will renounce them, to unite with us in spreading principles which they do not believe.

Lib. Your observations suggest another reason why a more liberal policy should be pursued at this day. Those who are so rigid in their attachment to the principles which our articles contain, as to be always insisting upon them, are perpetually giving offence by so doing; and instead of alluring men to unite with us, and thus strengthening our body, they drive them off, and are the means of adding to the numbers of those who do not think as we do. Should we all do so, our numbers would be greatly reduced, and we should not have it in our power to undertake any great things.

Th. If we must give up, or let alone all those points in which we differ from other denominations, in order to have great numbers with us, I see not why we may not as well give up our distinct organization at once, and connect ourselves with some other denomination. This would diminish the number of divisions, and increase the numbers of those to whom we should belong.

Lib. Perhaps the day is not far distant when something of that kind will be done; not, perhaps, in the way you suggest, by our going over entirely to any other existing denomination, but by their coming over to us. When we shall have all yielded those points which they are disposed to object against, so far as to be silent about them, it will be but reasonable that they should yield something to us. And it will be more honorable to our denomination, numerous and respectable as it is, to retain its name, and have others assume it, when we ask them to change nothing else. But if they manifest any reluctance to *that*, I should be willing to have each give up its old name, and agree on a new one, under which we could all unite. And indeed, I am sick of all sectarian distinctions and names, and should be glad to have the time arrive when they should be all laid aside, and all pilgrims be united under one general and appropriate name, *which* should never be the badge of any party. And I rejoice that that day is fast approaching.

Th. I think I do also ardently desire the time when there shall be no more sectarian distinctions nor party names, but when all professed friends to the Lord of the way shall be cordially united together upon a basis which the Lord himself shall approve. But this never can be done by rejecting, or treating with indifference, any thing which he requires us to believe and love, any thing for which he commands us earnestly to contend. Disobedience to his commands is not the way to meet his approbation. And doubtless, it is as true that he requires us to believe what he says, as it is that he requires us to do any thing else that he commands. When

all shall believe whatever the scriptures teach, and love those truths with the whole heart, they will be united together upon a basis which will render their union permanent and stable. Such is the time foretold, when "the watchmen shall see eye to eye, and lift up the voice together." But all those unions which are formed by giving up the truth, or any part of it, in order to harmonize with error, are of a different nature, and cannot long continue. They are nothing but unions in disobedience; and though they may seem to prosper for a time, while error and wickedness have their day of triumph, I rejoice that the day is coming, when it shall be fully understood, that, "though hand join in hand, the wicked shall not be unpunished." And I think that if we wish to secure the approbation of our Lord, we ought to keep ourselves clear from all entangling and ensnaring alliances with his enemies.

Lib. I have no doubt that you mean well; but I am sorry to find you entertaining opinions so little suited to this era of good feelings. Your notions are a century too late. But I hope you will learn better as you proceed on your journey, and hear and see more of the great and glorious things which are doing in this wonderful age.

F. w. I hope so too; for, to speak my feelings, brother Thoughtful's rigid and bigoted notions make him rather an uncomfortable companion.

Love-s. Yes; he is not content with the liberty of indulging his peculiarities, and talking in defence of them; but he attaches so much importance to them, that he seems to condemn every body else. Were it not for this, I should be willing to hear him advocate his notions sometimes, as he seems to do it so honestly; though I do not believe them, and in truth am not much edified with his conversation.

No-l. I am often amused with his metaphysics, which serve to beguile the tediousness of the way. But I am now rather impatient to have supper, and retire to rest; for I am quite tired with our long day's walk.

Lib. Supper must be nearly ready. I will go out and hasten it.

So the master of the house went out to expedite the supper; and Thoughtful and Ardent withdrew into a corner by themselves, and had a little conversation, as follows:

Ard. What do you think, brother, of this house? Is it right for us to stay here, and partake of the entertainment which may be afforded?

Th. I think the master of the house talks strangely, for a good man, and a true friend to the Lord of the way. But we have seen the charter of the house, and its rules and regulations, which we cordially approve. We have evidence that it is a house which was erected by the Lord of the way for the entertainment of pilgrims. And since we are here, I do not yet see it to be duty to withdraw from it in a hasty or irregular manner. It appears to be the table of our master which is spread for us; and if it is not served as we could wish it to be, nor filled with such guests as we think suitable, since these things have not taken place through our agency, nor by our consent, I believe it is our duty to remain for this time. A rash and hasty withdrawal from a table which our Lord has spread, and from a house which he has erected for

the accommodation of his friends, because of apprehended unworthiness in others, would not, I think, be justifiable. The efficacy of an ordinance does not depend upon the temper of mind of him who administers, but of him who receives it. And we may have communion with our Lord, if we have not with those who sit down with us at his table.

So the supper was brought in, and the guests sat down at his table. And while the master of the house was helping the guests, he spoke of the great love of the Lord of the way in making such provision for the entertainment of pilgrims, and of his great kindness to them in particular in bringing them thus far on their journey in safety. He enlarged also upon the glorious prospects before them, when they should reach the celestial city, and obtain the unfading crown which was the prize for which they ran. He dwelt much on the pleasures of love and union among pilgrims, and exhorted them to hold on as they had begun. Thoughtful and Ardent sat silent, apparently absorbed in deep and solemn thought. The eyes of Feel-well sparkled with pleasure, while following the speaker through his various topics of discourse; and now and then an expression of approbation and delight escaped his lips. Love-self seemed to enjoy himself very well; but No-law sat and partook of the supper with as little apparent emotion as of any ordinary meal. After supper it was proposed to sing a hymn; and Feel-well desired to have the one which he had heard with much delight at the new house Beautiful, to wit:

"Father of all, in every age,
In every clime ador'd,
By saint, by savage, and by sage.
Jehovah, Jove, or Lord." &c.

The master of the house, however, preferred the following, as better adapted to the occasion.

"How happy is the day,
Our eyes are blest to see;
When those of every name can meet,
In sweetest harmony.

Let party names, no more
The pilgrim world divide;
But all with kindred feelings join'd,
In union still abide.

Let ardent faith, revive
Our courage by the way;
And each in expectation live,
Of an eternal day.

Thus while we march along
Through this dark vale of tears,
The hope of an unfading crown,
Shall chase away our fears."

BUNYANUS.

For the Christian Magazine.

SELF-EXAMINATION.

Messrs. Editors,

WILL you permit me to make a few remarks, in your paper, on the business of self-examination? The importance of the *duty is* generally acknowledged. It is certainly acknowledged by one who feels himself to be immortal, and that he is now on trial for an immortal existence. If the subject of immortal existence comes home to any mind, that mind cannot remain indifferent to its prospects for eternity. And *if* the thought also crosses his mind that he may be called at any moment from this world, and have his condition unchangeably fixed in one of inconceivable glory and blessedness, or in one of unutterable wo, he will not remain indifferent. To his mind, the subject assumes a *real* importance. He will be anxious and diligent to learn the general character of that kingdom to which saints are travelling, and where all is peace and joy. This he may find delineated with fulness and truth on

the pages of his Bible. He wishes also to ascertain the character of those who are heirs of this kingdom. This too he may find fully and accurately drawn on the pages of his Bible. Then in order to come to a true result in the business of self-examination,—to a result that will not disappoint when the secrets of the heart shall be made known, it is important to keep close to the guidance of revealed truth; and while he reads that, 'without holiness no man shall see the Lord,' he may read, 'he that believeth in the Lord Jesus Christ shall be saved.' He that rejoices in the character of God, and *loves* to do his will, is passed from death unto life, and will not be brought into condemnation. Christians must have a particular object to which they aim in their self-examination. (I say Christians, because the careless sinner himself, as well as others, may *know* that he is an enemy to God, and if he will remain an enemy to God he must answer it.) The general object is self-knowledge. But, as many, who are professors, are frequently doubting whether they are Christians, and are fearful they have done wrong in making a profession; and as others who are not professors, are anxious to determine the question more satisfactorily to themselves whether they are Christians and have a right publicly to enrol themselves among those who love our Lord Jesus Christ; I shall suppose the object of examination is simply to determine this point, 'Am I a Christian?' 'Can I indulge that hope which bears up its possessor amid the trials of this life.

You may examine yourself by the spirit and temper of your prayers. What! Do you not pray? What is the reason? Is it because you have no time? Is it because you love the world more than you love prayer? Then be assured there is evidence of fearful strength against you. You cannot serve God and mammon. If you love the world so that you cannot pray, so that habitually you cannot delight in prayer, the love of God is not in you.

If you do pray, can you not know when your prayers go forth of feigned lips? Cannot you tell whether you love to pray? Why in the stillness of the evenings of the past week did you pray? You have knowledge from almost every day's occurrence to help you to decide this question. If any thing important and attainable becomes the object of your sincere and strong desire, are not your efforts to obtain it sincere and zealous? All who see your conduct will say that you are sincere and honest in the pursuit of that object. And you are conscious to yourself of *desiring* that object, and your efforts are evidence that your desire is sincere and honest. In this case cannot you say at once whether the whole is sincere or whether it is all feigned. So in the prayers that have ascended in the stillness of the evening, or the morning, and at other times, are you conscious they were sincere, that the honest desires of your soul were breathed forth—that they were the affectionate longings of that filial spirit which cries Abba, Father? Were they the prayers of the Pharisee? or were they the offerings of the lips while the heart was *cold* and *still*? God knows what the character of them was; and *you* are doubtless conscious of what it was. Then in the spirit and temper of your

prayers, you have in your own consciousness strong evidence whether you love God or not; whether sin is a burden to you and you wish to be delivered from it, whether you wish to be changed into the image of Christ, or are willing to remain in sin and be satisfied with earth. But if you say the heart is deceitful and you are therefore unwilling to be satisfied with the evidence from consciousness, you have additional evidence. The testimony of your conduct, of the influence of your prayers on your life, may be brought in and settle the question. I suppose you delight in prayer, at least at times. What then is the course of your life? He that loveth God keepeth his commandments, and with pleasure too, for his commandments are not grievous to his children. That they are dull to learn his will—that they possess an evil heart which inclines them to the world—that they do transgress in thought, word, and deed, is the cause of repentance. David sinned, and Peter; and they were grieved that they had offended God—they turned to him with the brokenness of a filial heart—found his forgiveness, and were more watchful in future. Is such your case?

Some in attempting to examine themselves look directly at their hearts as they are at the present moment without reference to past feeling and conduct; and they find nothing upon which they can fix the searching eye—all is emptiness, darkness. They are baffled in their attempts, and give up the important work. But let them look back upon the various scenes through which they have recently passed, and examine what their feelings were, and what their conduct, in this and the other circumstance, and they will find enough on which they can fix their attention, to decide what their character *is*. By our fruits we may know ourselves. He that loveth God keep*eth* his commandments. Have the emotions of your heart, and has your conduct through the day or week, been in accordance with the requisitions of the gospel? In view of promoting the glory of God, how is your heart affected? and in view of present transgression, how is it affected? I might pursue my remarks, but for the present I will stop for you to look at the state of your heart. Blessed are they that know and do the will of God. They shall be happy in his favour, and in his service.

S.

TRAFFICK IN ARDENT SPIRITS.

Extract from Rev. Dr. Beecher's Sermons on Intemperance.

THAT the traffick in ardent *spirits* is wrong, and *should be* abandoned as a great national evil, is evident from the following considerations.

1. It employs a multitude of men, and a vast amount of capital, to no useful purpose. The medicinal use of ardent spirits is allowed; for this however the apothecary can furnish an adequate supply: but considered as an article of commerce, for ordinary use, it adds nothing to animal or social enjoyment, to muscular power, to intellectual vigor, or moral feeling. It does, indeed, produce paroxisms of muscular effort, of intellectual vigor, and of exhilarated feeling, but it is done only by an improvident draft upon nature by anticipation, to be punished by a languor and debility proportioned to the excess. No man leaves behind him a more valu-

able product of labor, as the result of artificial stimulus, than the even industry of unstimulated nature would have produced; or blesses the world with better specimens of intellectual power; or instructs it by a better example; or drinks enjoyment from a fuller, sweeter cup, than that which nature provides. But if the premises are just, who can resist the conclusion? To what purpose is all this waste? Is it not the duty of every man to serve his generation in some useful employment? Is not idleness a sin? But in what respect does that occupation differ from idleness which adds nothiug to national prosperity, or to individual or social enjoyment? Agriculture, commerce, and the arts are indispensable to the perfection of human character, and the formation of the happiest state of society, and if some evils are inseparable from their prosecution, there is a vast overbalancing amount of good. But where is the good produced by the traffick in ardent spirits, to balance the enormous evils inseparable from the trade? What drop of good does it pour into the ocean of misery which it creates? And is all this expense of capital, and time, and effort, to be sustained for nothing? Look at the mighty system of useless operations—the fleet of vessels running to and fro—the sooty buildings throughout the land, darkening the heavens with their steam and smoke—the innumerable company of boats, and waggons and horses, and men—a more numerous cavalry then ever shook the blood stained plains of Europe—a larger convoy than ever bore on the waves the baggage of an army—and more men than were ever devoted at once to the work of desolation and blood. All these begin, continue, and end their days in the production, and distribution of a liquid, the entire consumption of which is useless. Should all the capital thus employed, and all the gains acquired be melted into one mass and thrown into the sea, nothing would be subtracted from national wealth or enjoyment. Had all the men and animals slept the whole time, no vacancy of good had been occasioned.

Is this then the manner in which rational beings should be willing to spend their days—in which immortal beings should fill up the short period of their probation, and make up the account to be rendered to God of the deeds done in the body—in which benevolent beings desiring to emulate the goodness of the great God, should be satisfied to employ their powers?

It is admitted that the trade employs and sustains many families, and that in many instances the profits are appropriated to useful purposes. But this is no more than might have been said of the slave trade. The same families might be as well sustained in some other way, and the same profits might be earned and applied to useful purposes in some other calling. The earth is not so narrow, nor population so dense, nor the useful avocations so overstocked, as that large portions of time, and capital, and labor, may be devoted to the purpose of sustaining life merely, without reference to public utility.

The merchant who deals in ardent spirits is himself a loser; for a temperate population consume more, and pay better, and live longer, than the intemperate; and among such a population merchants would do more business, and secure better profits than

when they depend for any part of their gains upon the sale of ardent spirits. What merchant looking out for a place where to establish himself in trade, would neglect the invitation of temperate, thrifty farmers and mechanics, and settle down in a village of riot and drunkenness—made up of tipplers, widows, and beggared children—of old houses, broken windows, and dilapidated fences?

I push not this argument reproachfully, but for the purpose of awakening conscientious investigation. We are a free people. No imperial *ukase*, or forest of bayonets can make us moral and industrious, or turn us back if we go astray. Our own intelligence and moral energy must reclaim us, or we shall perish in our sins.

2. The amount of suffering and mortality inseparable from the commerce in ardent spirits, renders it an unlawful article of trade.

The wickedness is proverbial of those who in ancient days caused their children to pass through the fire unto Moloch. But how many thousands of children are there in our land who endure daily privations and sufferings, which render life a burden, and would have made the momentary pang of infant sacrifice a blessing? Theirs is a lingering, living death. There never was a Moloch to whom were immolated yearly as many children as are immolated, or kept in a state of constant suffering in this land of nominal Christianity. We have no drums and gongs to drown their cries, neither do we make convocations, and bring them all out for one mighty burning. The fires which consume them, are slow fires, and they blaze balefully in every part of our land; throughout which the cries of injured children, and orphans go up to heaven. Could all these woes, the product of intemperance, be brought out into one place, and the monster who inflicts the sufferings be seen personified, the nation would be furious with indignation. Humanity, conscience, religion, all would conspire, to stop a work of such malignity.

We are appalled, and shocked, at the accounts from the east, of widows burnt upon the funeral piles of their departed husbands. But what if those devotees of superstiton, the Brahmins, had discovered a mode of prolonging the lives of the victims for years amid the flames, and by these protracted burnings were accustomed to torture life away? We might almost rouse up a crusade to cross the deep, to stop by force such inhumanity. But alas! we should leave behind us on our own shores, more wives in the fire, than we should find of widows thus sacrificed in all the east; a fire too, which, besides its action upon the body, tortures the soul by lost affections, and ruined hopes, and prospective wretchedness.

It is high time to enter upon the business of collecting facts on this subject. The statistics of intemperance should be published; for no man has comprehended as yet the height, and depth, and length, and breadth of this mighty evil.

We execrate the cruelties of the slave trade—the husband torn from the bosom of his wife—the son from his father—brothers and sisters separated forever—whole families in a moment ruined! But are there no similar enormities to be witnessed in the United States? None indeed perpetrated by the bayonet—but many, very many, perpetrated by intemperance.

Every year thousands of families are robbed of fathers, brothers, husbands, friends. Every year widows and orphans are multiplied, and grey heirs are brought with sorrow to the grave—no disease makes such inroads upon families, blasts so many hopes, destroys so many lives, and causes so many mourners to go about the streets, because man goeth to his long home.

We have heard of the horrors of the middle passage—the transportation of slaves—the chains—the darkness—the stench—the mortality and living madness of wo—and it is dreadful. But bring together the victims of intemperance, and crowd them into one vast lazar-house, and sights of wo quite as appalling would meet your eyes.

Yes, in this nation there is a middle passage of slavery, and darkness, and chains, and disease, and death. But it is a middle passage, not from Africa to America, but from time to eternity, and not of slaves whom death will release from suffering, but of those whose sufferings at death do but just begin. Could all the sighs of these captives be wafted on one breeze, it would be loud as thunder. Could all their tears be assembled, they would be like the sea.

The health of a nation is a matter of vast importance, and none may directly and avowedly sport with it. The importation and dissemination of fevers for filthy lucre's sake, would not be endured, and he who should import and plant the seed of trees, which, like the fabled Upas, poisoned the atmosphere, and paved the earth around with bones, would meet with universal execration. The construction of morasses and stagnant lakes, sending out poisonous exhalations, and depopulating the country around, would soon be stopped by the interposition of law. And should a foreign army land upon our shores, to levy such a tax upon us as intemperance levies, and to threaten our liberties as intemperance threatens them, and to inflict such enormous sufferings as intemperance inflicts, no mortal power could resist the swelling tide of indignation that would overwhelm it.

It is only in the form of ardent spirits in the way of a lawful trade extended over the entire land, that fevers may be imported and disseminated—that trees of death may be planted—that extensive morasses may be opened, and a moral *miasma* spread over the nation—and that an armed host may land, to levy upon us enormous taxations, to undermine our liberties, bind our hands, and put our feet in fetters. This dreadful work is going on, and yet the nation sleeps. Say not that all these evils result from the abuse of ardent spirits; for as human nature is constituted, the abuse is as certain as any of the laws of nature. The commerce therefore, in ardent spirits, which produces no good, and produces a certain and an immense amount of evil, must be regarded as an unlawful commerce, and ought, upon every principle of humanity, and patriotism, and conscience, and religion, to be abandoned and proscribed.

For the Christian Magazine.

NOTICE OF A LATE PAMPHLET.

A PAMPHLET was lately handed us, containing "A Sermon by Rev. Dr. Emmons, on the Perdition of Judas," and a "Review of the same by Rev. David Pickering of Providence, R. I." published, as

it is stated, "by consent of the authors." We infer from the consent of the venerable author of the Sermon to its appearing before the public in this connexion, that he considers the ancient statute, prohibiting the ox and the ass to plough together, as no longer of divine authority;—although we have no objection to its appearing in this way, except to the *company* in which we find it. The Sermon is one of distinguished excellence, founded on the declaration of the Saviour respecting Judas, "It had been good for that man, if he had not been born." In speaking of Judas, the writer shows, under several particulars, that "he was a man whom God was pleased to treat with distinguishing favour;" that "God used no compulsive measures to lead him into sin"—but "the most powerful means to restrain him from it;" and yet that "Judas was a prodigy of wickedness"—who "deserved eternal perdition"—and "is finally lost." He farther shows, that "God brought Judas into being to answer wise and noble designs," and that he "decreed his life, and death, and final state, before he was born." In his concluding reflections, the writer insists, that the case of Judas, "subverts the scheme of universal salvation;" "removes all the objections which ever have been made, or can be made, against the doctrine of divine decrees;" and shows that "sin may be the occasion of good;"—but still, "that sin's being the occasion of good, furnishes no excuse to the sinner"—and "no encouragement to commit sin." The Sermon is written with the author's usual clearness of method, force of reasoning, and beautiful simplicity of style. The case of Judas is fairly and fully stated, and the best use is made of it, in removing some of the many errors, with which unstable souls are beguiled and ruined.

Thus much for the Sermon; but—alas, for poor human nature! what shall we say of the Review! To give its character would be impossible; for it has none. And to trace the steps, by which its author arrives at his various conclusions,

. . . . . "quâ signa sequendi
Falleret indeprensus et irremeabilis error,"

one would need the thread by which Theseus guided himself through the inextricable mazes of the Cretan labyrinth.

In this Review, (so called,) *Mr.* Pickering sits himself down, with no little pomposity, to refute the Sermon of Dr. Emmons; and he discourses learnedly about philosophy and metaphysics; explains Latin and Greek; expatiates upon "the voluminous piles" of authors; not omitting to mention some marvellous facts, respecting persons who have died with the *dysentery*—of which disorder, by the way, he doubts not but Judas himself died. He dogmatizes and censures with the airs of a master, and takes all possible pains to make his readers believe that he is a very great and learned man. And if he had laid himself out to convince them, that he was a sheer novice, or mere tyro, he could not possibly have succeeded better. He shows himself to be ignorant, not only of his subject, and of the most common rules of reasoning, but of his own mother tongue. He confounds the most obvious distinctions; mistakes or perverts the plain meaning of words; gives us conclusions without premises, and premises without conclusions; and halts and blunders in a path, where the wayfaring man, though

a fool, need not err. And to crown all, he is so confident that he has refuted the Sermon, that he consents to send forth his medley Review in the same pamphlet with it.

If Mr. Pickering has here given us a fair specimen of his talents and acquisitions, we have only to express our astonishment, that any men of common intelligence can suffer themselves to be deluded by such means; and our still greater astonishment, that any considerable number of the good people of Providence should be induced to patronize him, as an *editor*, and a religious *teacher!* We are aware, indeed, that it takes a great many sorts of persons to make up a world; and we infer from the fact, that such characters as the author of this Review exist, that their existence will be over-ruled for wise and good purposes; but it must be yet in the inscrutable counsels of heaven, what these purposes may be.

We are glad, on the whole, that the pamphlet before us has been published; as it has given to numbers, who seldom read or hear the truth, a very excellent Sermon. We pray it may not prove to any of them a savor of death.

He that prolongs his meals, and sacrifices his time, as well as his other conveniences, to his luxury, how quickly does he out-sit his pleasure! And then, how is all the following time bestowed upon ceremony and surfeit; till at length, after a long fatigue of eating, and drinking, and babbling, he concludes the great work of dining genteelly, and so makes a shift to rise from table, that he may lie down upon his bed; where after he has slept himself into some use of himself, by much ado he staggers to his table again, and there acts over the same brutish scene; so that he passes his whole life in a dozed condition between sleeping and waking, with a kind of drowsiness upon his senses; which, what pleasure it can be, is hard to conceive; all that is of it, dwells upon the tip of his tongue, and within the compass of his palate: a worthy prize for a man to purchase with the loss of his time, his reason, and himself.—*Robert South.*

Three times Christ was spoken to, while he was here upon earth, by voices from heaven, and these all three found him praying. See Luke iii. 21.—ix. 29. John xii. 27, 28.—*M. Henry.*

GODLY SORROW, AND THE SORROW OF THE WORLD.

Usually, the sting of sorrow is this, that it neither removes nor alters the thing we sorrow for; and so is but a kind of reproach to our reason, which will be sure to accost us with this dilemma. Either the thing we sorrow for is to be remedied, or it is not; if it is, why then do we spend the time in mourning, which should be spent in an active applying of remedies? But if it is not; then is our sorrow vain, as tending to no real effect. For no man can weep his father, or his friend, out of the grave, or mourn himself out of a bankrupt condition. But this spiritual sorrow is effectual to one of the greatest and highest purposes that mankind can be concerned in. It is a means to avert an impendent wrath, to disarm an offended Omnipotence;

and even to fetch a soul out of the very jaws of hell; so that the end and consequence of this sorrow sweetens the sorrow itself; and, as *Solomon* says, *in the midst of laughter, the heart is sorrowful;* so in the midst of sorrow here, the heart may rejoice; for while it mourns, it reads, that *those that mourn shall be comforted;* and so while the penitent weeps with one eye, he views his deliverance with the other. But then for the external expressions and vent of sorrow; we know that there is a certain pleasure in weeping; it is the discharge of a big and a swelling grief; of a full and a strangling discontent; and therefore he that never had such a burthen upon his heart, as to give him opportunity thus to ease it, has one pleasure in this *world* yet to come.—*Robert South.*

Divers notions not simply passing our capacity to know, we are not yet in condition to ken, by reason of our circumstances here, in this dark corner of things to which we are confined, and wherein we lie under many disadvantages of attaining knowledge. He that is shut up in a close place, and can only peep through chinks, who standeth in a valley, and hath his prospect intercepted, who is encompassed with fogs, who hath but a dusky light to view things by, whose eyes are weak or foul, how can he see much or far, how can he discern things remote, minute or subtile, clearly and distinctly? Such is our case; our mind is pent up in the body, and looketh only through those clefts by which objects strike our sense; its intuition is limited within a very small compass; it resideth in an atmosphere of fancy, stuft with exhalations from temper, appetite, passion, interest; its light is scant and faint (for sense and experience do reach only some few gross matters of fact, light infused, and revelation imparted to us, proceed from arbitrary dispensation in definite measures) our ratiocination consequently from such principles, must be very short and defective; nor are our minds ever thoroughly sound, or pure and defecate from prejudices: hence no wonder, that now we are wholly ignorant of divers great truths, or have but a glimmering notion of them, which we may, and hereafter shall come fully and clearly to understand; so that even the apostles, the secretaries of heaven, might say, *We know in part, and we prophesy in part; We now see through a glass darkly, but then face to face.* —*Barrow.*

THE FLEETING TENURE OF HUMAN LIFE.

We flutter, as it were, a day in the sun-beam of existence; the shades of evening speedily close around, and then we mingle with the things that have been! Man drops the mask of mortality, from life's great drama. The petty distinctions of life attend him no further. The undistinguished bourne of futurity is unassailable by terrestial splendor and pageantry. The dross of the world must yield precedence to moral worth zealously exercised in the sure and certain hope of its exceeding great reward. "Thou, O Lord, changest his countenance, and sendest him away." The summer's sun will shine in brightness on the spot where he lies low and forgotten; but its beams will give neither light nor heat

to the lonely tenant of the grave. The leaves of autumn will fall, rustling and mournful on that clod —emblem how striking of his fate, who once trod with pride upon the dust which now covers him! Winter's dreary snow shall veil the neglected spot, and nourish into existence the green herb that springs from his ashes. Spring, too, shall return, but not a leaf of his sublunary course shall germinate afresh. Oh, that we duly considered this—that we thought more of our latter end! The recollection of our mortality would abase the pride of human reason, and lead us to bow with resignation and praise to the decrees of the Almighty, and to rejoice in the ground of confidence and hope, "that is laid for us in Christ Jesus." We should then aim to become Christians indeed! that is, not merely to believe in the Saviour, but to study to imitate that pattern of infinite excellence and unparalleled goodness.—*Anon.*

APHORISMS.

Persons who see the faults of others, while they remain blind to their own, are like Seneca's wiches, who never wore their eyes, except when they went abroad.

Is it not better that your friends should tell you your faults, than your enemies should talk of them publickly?

God will excuse our prayers for ourselves, whenever we are prevented from them, by being occupied by such good works as will entitle us to the prayers of others.

Seldom commend men to their faces, and never disparage them behind their backs. If you know any good of them, let others know it; if any ill that you would repeat, tell it to themselves.

Ordinations and Installations.

Sept. 22,—Rev. SAMUEL Y. GARRISON was ordained as an Evangelist, at Hopkinsville, Ky. by the Muhlenburgh Presbytery.

Sept. 26,—Rev. NATHANIEL WALES was ordained as Pastor of the first Congregational Church in Belfast, Me. Sermon by Rev. Prof. Smith.

Sept. 26,—Rev. JUBILEE WELLMAN was installed over the Congregational Church and Society in Warner, N. H. Sermon by Rev. Dr. Wood, of Boscawen.

Sept. 27,—Rev. JOHN GARRETSON was ordained and installed Pastor of the Reformed Dutch Church in Middleborough, by the Classis of Schoharie. Sermon by Rev. J. F. Schermerhorn.

Oct. 3,—Rev. TERTIUS S. CLARKE was ordained over the second Congregational Church and Parish of Deerfield. Sermon by Rev. Dorus Clarke, of Blandford.

Oct. 3,—Ordained at Durham, Greene co. N. Y., Mr. ALANSON B. CHITTENDEN, and Mr. TIMOTHY STOW. Sermon by Rev. W. Fisher, of Merideth.

Oct. 4,—Rev. JOHN A. PROUDFIT was installed Pastor of the first Presbyterian Church and Society in Newburyport. Sermon by Rev. Dr. Proudfit of Salem, N. Y.

Oct. 7,—Rev. AUSTIN RICHARDS was ordained at Francistown, N. H. as Pastor of the Church and Union Congregational Society in that place. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Lord, of Amherst.

Oct. 19,—Mr. GEORGE W. BETHUNE was ordained a minister of the Gospel in the Presbyterian Church, Pearl-st. New York. Sermon by Rev. Dr. McMurray.

Oct. 24,—Mr. PETER SPARKS was ordained as Pastor of the Baptist Church at Lyons Farms, Essex Co. N. J. Sermon by Rev. David Jones, of Lower Dublin, Pa.

Oct. 31,—Rev. MARK TUCKER was installed by the Presbytery of Troy, as Pastor of the 2nd Presbyterian Church in Troy, New York. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Kennedy, of Whitehall.

Nov. 1,—Rev. JOHN M. PUTNAM was installed at Epsom, N. H. Sermon by Rev. Rufus A. Putnam, of Fitchburg, Mass.

Nov. 7,—Rev. ELIJAH DEMOND was installed Pastor of the Church and Congregation in Lincoln. Sermon by Rev. [illegible] Codman, of Dorchester.

Poetry.

From the Recorder and Telegraph.

ON THE DEATH OF THE REV. EDWARD PAYSON, D. D.

A servant of the living God is dead!—
His errand hath been well, and early done,
And early hath he gone to his reward.
He shall come no more forth, but to his sleep
Hath silently laid down, and so shall rest.

Would ye bewail our brother? He hath gone
To Abraham's bosom. He shall no more thirst,
Nor hunger, but forever in the eye,
Holy and meek, of Jesus, he may look,
Unchided, and untempted, and unstain'd.
Would ye bewail our brother? He hath gone
To sit down with the prophets by the clear
And chrystal waters; he hath gone to list
Isaiah's harp and David's, and to walk
With Enoch and Elijah, and the host
Of the just men made perfect. He shall bow
At Gabriel's Hallelujah, and unfold
The scroll of the Apocalypse with John,
And talk of Christ with Mary, and go back
To the last supper, and the garden prayer
With the belov'd disciple. He shall hear
The story of the Incarnation told
By Simeon, and the Triune mystery
Burning upon the fervent lips of Paul.
He shall have wings of glory, and shall soar
To the remoter firmaments, and read
The order and the harmony of stars;
And in the might of knowledge, he shall bow
In the deep pauses of Archangel harps,
And humble as the Seraphim, shall cry—
Who by his searchings finds thee out, OH GOD!
There shall he meet his children who have gone
Before him, and as other years roll on,
And his lov'd flock go up to him, his hand
Again shall lead them gently to the Lamb
And bring them to the living waters there.
Is it so good to die! and shall we mourn
That he is taken early to his rest?—
Tell me! Oh mourner for the man of God!
Shall we bewail our brother, that he died?

ROY.